Soc HQ 7.6

MOTHER EARTH

PUBLISHED BY
EMMA GOLDMAN
OFFICE 210 E. 13th. St. N.Y. City.

P.O. Box 217
Madison Sq. Station

PRICE
10c. PER. COPY.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
The Religious Bigot	Poem	1
The Latest Police Outrage		2
Observations and Comments		4
The Eleventh of November	H. KELLY	7
Anarchists of America	WILLIAM HOLMES	11
What is Morality?	MARGARET GRANT	21
Modern Science and Anarchism *(Continuation)*	PETER KROPOTKIN	30
Aphorisms	J. M. GOTTESMAN	37
A Letter from Russia		38
International Notes		47
To the Readers of "Mother Earth"	EMMA GOLDMAN	55
The Rebellion of Alvira	EMMA LEE	56
Unexpected Charity	SADAKICHI HARTMANN	58
Advertisements		60

ISAAC GOLDMANN Co., Printers 1920 200 William Street, N. Y

HARVARD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY JAN 10 1945

Ingraham Fund

10c. A COPY $1 A YEAR

MOTHER EARTH

Monthly Magazine Devoted to Social Science and Literature

Published Every 15th of the Month

EMMA GOLDMAN, Publisher, P. O. Box 217, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter April 9, 1906, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Vol. I **NOVEMBER, 1906** **No. 9**

FANATICISM.

By CHRISTOPHER CAUSTIC.

I hate your hypocritic race
Who prate about pretended grace;
With tabernacle phizzes,
Who think Omnipotence to charm,
By faces longer than my arm!
O, what a set of quizzes!

I hate your wretches, wild and sad,
Like gloomy wights in Bedlam mad,
*Or vile Old Bailey * culprits;*
Who, with a sacrilegious zeal,
Death and damnation dare to deal
From barn-erected pulpits.

I hate that hangman's aspect bluff,
In him, whose disposition's rough,
The porcupine surpasses;
Who thinks that heaven is in his power,
Because his sullen looks might sour
A barrel of molasses.

* English Insane Asylum and Prison.

PRIVATE LIBRARY Samuel A. Black

POLICE BRUTALITY.

Liberty by the grace of the police and the might of the club was again brought home to us in the most brutal and unspeakable manner. A club of young boys and girls, peaceably assembled Saturday night, October 27th, to listen to a discourse as to whether or not Leon Czolgosz was an Anarchist. At the close of the meeting three of the speakers—Julius Edelson, M. Moscow, and M. Rubinstein—were arrested and placed under $1,000 bail each. Tuesday, October 30th, a meeting was called to protest against the arrest of these boys and the suppression of free speech. Mr. Bolton Hall, H. Kelly, Max Baginski and myself were announced to speak. The meeting proceeded in absolute order, with Julius Edelson, who had meanwhile been released on bail through Mr. Bolton Hall, as the first speaker. He had spoken barely twenty minutes when several detectives jumped on the platform and placed him under arrest, while twenty-five police officers began to club the audience out of the hall. A young girl of eighteen, Pauline Slotnikoff, was pulled off a chair and brutally dragged across the floor of the hall, tearing her clothing and bruising her outrageously. Another girl, fourteen years of age, Rebecca Edelson, was roughly handled and put under arrest, because she failed to leave the hall as quickly as ordered. The same was done to three other women—Annie Pastor, Rose Rogin, and Lena Smitt—for no other reason except that they were unable to reach the bottom of the stairs fast enough to suit the officers. I was about to leave when one of the officers struck me in the back, and put me under arrest.

Fortunately, Mr. Bolton Hall and H. Kelly could not be present at the meeting; they, too, might have been clubbed out of the hall.

Six women and four men were packed like sardines into a patrol-wagon and hustled off to the station house, where we were kept in vile air and subjected to vulgar and brutal annoyance by the police until the following morning; then we were brought before a magistrate and put under $1,000 bail each for *assault.* Fancy girls of fourteen and eighteen, of delicate physique, assaulting twenty-five two-hundred-and-fifty-pounders!

If we as a nation were not such unspeakable hypocrites, we should long since have placed a club instead of a torch in the hand of the Goddess of Liberty—the police mace is not merely the symbol, but the very essence of our "liberty and order."

EMMA GOLDMAN.

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS.

The National Purity Federation, recently assembled in Chicago, had a surprising feature—the presence of Anthony B. Comstock. What on earth has this fellow in common with purity? Even the approach to purity—cleanliness, would feel outraged by the nearness of this man. Comstock sees nothing but sin in human emotions and considers the body of woman as something vile, to be covered with sackcloth and ashes, and not to be spoken of, nor written about. Had the women of the National Purity Federation understood the real meaning of purity, their first point on the programme would read "out with this man, Anthony B. Comstock."

* * *

The superstition of words is no less harmful than the belief in an almighty deity controlling the destinies of man. We speak of truth and imagine something outside of things and man, something hidden behind the clouds, as it were, that will some day descend into our world of falsehoods, as the holy spirit descended upon the Apostles. The truth however is in ourselves, not outside of us. She can triumph only when we make it part of our lives and deeds. So long as man continues to live in conditions that force deception; Truth can not materialize. Again, we speak of Love and Justice and imagine forces floating about in space, awaiting an opportunity to manifest themselves to man. Vain hope! The good and the beautiful come not from the clouds, they grow within man. He needs but guard against these forces being stunted and deadened by corrupting influences. Nor have we the right to assume that man is inherently depraved. Regardless of our boasted benefits of civilization, it is an undisputed fact that our social life hinders the development of the finer qualities of the individual. Man's innermost yearnings and hopes center themselves upon gods and words only, because he fails to recognize the meaning of real life, and to draw therefrom true harmony and beauty.

* * *

The hopes of the Anarchists for a grand future are based upon the exercise of the feeling of solidarity of

free individuals. We do not wish to catechise people. The business of making man uniform we leave to military drillers, prison authorities, and political levelers. Anarchism recognizes the diversity of life, the differentiation of individuality in its fullest sense. It finds in voluntary communism—free enjoyment of commodities—the safest material basis for the highest development of diversity, which after all is the only creative source of life. Social institutions can have but one reason for existence, to lift man out of his bondage; but in the name of various deities, man has ever been subjugated, he was ever to lose himself for the sake of something foreign to his real nature. In Anarchism, however, the individual is to re-find himself, and to become a conscious molder of the conditions of life.

* * *

It is characteristic of the ruling class that it never learns from experience. Since time immemorial Tyrants have striven to extinguish the fires of liberty and to strangle all the noble aspirations of man—all in vain; ever brighter burn the fires, for persecution is like oil on the altar of liberty.

History, the most ancient as well as the most modern, teaches the same lesson. In 1887 Anarchy was "hanged till dead" in this country. Lo! behold the resurrection, hundredfold.

Will Tyrants ever learn?

* * *

Freemen! Listen to the clarion call! lay down the tools of your labor! rest from your weary toil! exercise your sacred prerogative! Vote!

It is true that it does not matter whether you vote or not, since the result will be precisely alike. The sensation of being eaten by Mr. Lion or Mr. Tiger is essentially the same; nevertheless, lucky freeman! you have your choice. Say which you will be eaten by! What! you would prefer to be devoured by a sheep? Fool! sheep do not eat sheep. What? you do not wish to be eaten? Oh, dear! how funny! as if that were the question!

Ho, freemen! come cast your votes! Oh, holy and precious privilege! Oh, marvel of the ages! the flock may choose by whom it shall be devoured! Which shall it be? Mr. Tiger or Mr. Lion? Hearst or Hughes?

Who? Hearst? Oh, Hearst! he's the friend of the people, God bless him! Just pin your faith to him, and you'll have no trouble at all. Why, he lies awake nights, robbing himself of sleep so as to take advantage of the stillness to think for you. If you don't believe it, ask him. Ask him about that other fellow, Hughes—the wretch. There's the one that will rob you of your precious privilege of the ballot. A tool of the plunderbund!

Who? Hughes? Oh, Hughes! He's so pure and incorruptible that he simply can't sleep until he has taken his conscience off. That's the man for you! You'll be safe with him. Why, our own Theodore vouches for him. Don't you remember what he did with the insurance people? Well! you wouldn't vote against him, would you? And talk to him about Hearst—the scoundrel! A regular corporationist! Hughes knows all about him. If Hearst gets in, look out! that's all! just look out!

What scoundrels they all are! Not our rulers. Oh, no! only our would-be rulers. Not our judiciary, but only our would-be judiciary. And hush! don't say a word against the police. That was only a joke of the mayor's that he had had the police transferred to new posts so that they could not help the politicians to stuff the ballot boxes.

And yet, what is this about our judges? The lawyers of New York—and they surely ought to know—say that the political parties put corrupt judges on the bench; men who will give decisions at the behest of politicians or of capitalists. This means that such judges are now on the bench. Fie then! to besmirch the ermine! But they insist that it is so true that they must nominate a set of pure and good and incorruptible men for judges. Alas! to think that our judges have been corrupt! to think that judges would sell their decisions! that magistrates would share—or do they "divvy up"?—with professional bondsmen and extortionate jailers! And this a country of law and order! Why, it simply cannot be true. To say that our rulers are what Hughes says Hearst is, or what Hearst says Hughes is: to say that our judges are what our foremost lawyers say they are; to say that our legislators are what our capitalists know they are, is to say that the foundations of the state are rotten. Worse than that, it is to say—But listen to a story:

Bocaccio tells it better, but this is it: A Jew, in the middle ages, became a convert to Christianity after a visit to Rome to see the Pope and the cardinals. A wondering friend asked him how he could become a Christian after witnessing the profligacy and corruption at Rome: "Ah," said the Jew, "if Christianity can endure with what I have witnessed, it must hold the truth within it."

The anarchistic moral of the story is that the people would be very happy and very good without government since they can be even as they are under such unspeakably awful conditions as, according to the testimony of expert witnesses, prevail in all departments of the state.

Andrew Library Carnegie says that Hearst, in the campaign, used "his money to advance his own interest. Which is base." Think of a man using his money like that! Base? Why, the thing is unheard of. The people must have been shocked when they discovered it. Thank Heaven! Andrew is still with us. The dear, conscientious old robber! Catch him using his own money! He uses our money. And we thank him for all he gives back.

And the moral of that story is: Be sure you steal enough.

❦ ❦ ❦

THE 11TH OF NOVEMBER.

By H. KELLY.

The anniversary of the death of the Chicago martyrs will always awaken tender memories and suggest problems. Those memories will develop the tender and emotional sides of our natures; and reflection over the problems will give us a broader and deeper outlook on life.

The "Riddle of the Universe" remains a riddle to many of us, but in spite of seemingly futile efforts to solve it, we still continue grappling with it; and slowly but surely nature unfolds her secrets to us. Generations yet to come will analyze our actions and will try tc fathom the promptings of our beings just as we do in the case of those who have gone before us. Why do men live, conduct themselves this way or that way, and, after summing up the pros and cons of a given question, act in a given manner, even to the point of sacrificing life itself? These will always be fascinating ques-

tions to solve, and solving them only partially will give exquisite pleasure to the investigator and will clear the path for future generations.

The reasons which actuated the Chicago Anarchists to offer up their lives and liberties for the principles they professed are the same in character as those which animated the persons who have done similar things in past ages. It is no new thing for men to suffer and die for what they believed to be true; and we can imagine society disintegrating and the race perishing as easily as we can conceive that these habits become extinct in men. The desire for justice, liberty and human brotherhood is as old as civilized society; nay, older, for we discover similar ideas and customs existing before men lived in what we call civilized society.

It is probable that Spies and his associates knew they were toying with death in attacking vested interests; it is very likely true that in their zeal and enthusiasm for their cause they never troubled themselves much about it. When the fatal 4th of May came and their arrest followed, they realized the immensity of the task they had undertaken; thoughts which had been nebulous in their minds took definite form during their sojourn in prison, and they grew into their full moral and intellectual powers.

Judged solely from the standpoint of their effect upon organized society, the eighteen months the men spent in prison were most valuable to Anarchism, and most damaging to existing institutions. The long months gave them time to ripen and to come to their own; for their speeches betray a depth of insight into human society, a love of justice and humanity and a singleness of purpose that stand as mute yet powerful witnesses against their traducers and murderers. One of the most beautiful and most touching features of the trial was the faith of most of the men in the sense of justice in mankind in general and in their accusers in particular. Parsons, with his great love of humanity welling up in his heart, could not believe in the possibility of their conviction. All his traditions were against it. Was he not a descendant of men who had fought and bled in the revolution against George III., a revolution that had caused Paine to give to the world the Rights of Man and

Jefferson to pen his immortal Declaration of Independence? How could he believe that a nation that had voluntarily freed four millions of slaves and caused thousands upon thousands of men to lay down their lives, some for State rights, some for the preservation of the Union—in short for an ideal, freedom as they understood it—would put five men to death for advocating a still higher ideal of freedom?

Spies, with just a touch of cynicism in his nature and with the vision of a seer, was under no illusions on the subject, and welcomed Parsons mournfully when the latter returned like a hero of old to take his place by the side of his comrades. Spies said, "Parsons, you are returning to certain death," and so it proved. Romance is still alive in the world when an Albert Parsons can return of his own free will to share the burdens and dangers of his comrades and, when in sight of the gallows, he can refuse a commutation of sentence, which would eventually mean freedom, except on terms of equality with his comrades. When I think of the Atlanta race riots and the burning of negroes, I remember that Parsons was born south of Mason and Dixon's line; and hope revives within me.

Anarchism being a philosophy of life it is impossible to measure its depth with a yard stick, or its adherents by those who profess its principles. It is equally impossible to decide to what extent the Chicago tragedy influenced the growth and development of the Anarchist philosophy. That it influenced it greatly is without question, and meetings to commemorate the event are held in every civilized country in the world. The reason for such commemorations is not far to seek. The victims were men of deep sympathy, gifted imagination and intellectual ability approaching genius. Their virtues were of the positive order, and after having plumbed the depths of human society, they went forth into the world with all the zeal of disciples to install hope where indifference or despair had previously reigned. They saw much misery and ignorance in the world, but as they did not believe in God or that "man was created in his image," they did not believe man was inherently bad. Grave evils existed in the world, but as all men possess the spirit of solidarity, to a greater or lesser de-

gree, they saw a solution of these great social problems by a society based upon freedom; not freedom as is commonly understood, but an equal right to the earth and an opportunity to live one's own life in one's own way. They saw the hollowness and hypocrisy of such words as "the inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" when one man had to seek the consent of another for the right to work and live. It filled them with indignation and disgust to hear people prating about the dignity of labor when all their lives they lived by exploiting others, and like Siegfried with the Dragon, they determined to go forth to conquer injustice or die.

Men of high ideals, they were of the people and did not forget the practical side of life. Throwing themselves into the labor movement, they soon became leaders by sheer force of merit and by the irony of fate it was over so trifling a reform as the eight-hour day that they lost their lives. Workers themselves, they realized the necessity for reforms in the condition of the wage earner at that time and devoted themselves to a shortening of the hours of labor and an increase of wages by means of trade unions, and they did this with as much zeal as if those aims were the ultimate of their ideal instead of being merely a means. Harbingers of a new time it was this practical application of their talents to the every-day affairs of life that endeared them to the hearts of the workers. The latter saw in them not doctrinaires, but comrades who lived and suffered with them. Understanding their class, they sought to encourage them with an intelligent sympathy while pointing out their ideals. Far ahead of their time, they were as Spies said, "birds of the coming storm" who came to inspire and to warn. Their death was a logical conclusion of their mission.

He who attacks grave abuses does so at his peril, as those who study history well know. Brilliant advocates of a great cause—the emancipation of man, they accomplished far more by their death than they could have done had they continued to live.

Truth seems twice a truth to most of us when its advocate is a man of high moral character, who tries to live the ideas he puts before others; this was the case of the Chicago martyrs; hence the tenderness and respect that gathers in force about their names as time rolls on.

By "moral character" we do not mean that adherence to the hypocritical protestations of our so-called "good citizens," which is at its best mere conventionality, but a morality which, while seeking freedom for one's self, will refuse to invade the freedom of others, which comprehends that to exploit their fellowman is as unjust as to allow their fellowman to exploit them. In short, that morality which says "labor is the source of all wealth" and that the fruits thereof belong to those who produce it, all sophistry to the contrary notwithstanding. They loved humanity not wisely but too well, and the masses deserted them as they have always deserted their champions. Their influence was felt, however, and will increase in years to come. The road to freedom has ever been dark and stormy and countless victims have perished on the way. Others will follow and perish, but the pilgrimage continues; and out of the multitude who travel, some will reach the goal, and on their journey will leave finger prints to guide those who follow.

When the day of emancipation finally comes and the perspective is great enough we shall appreciate the Chicago martyrs at their true value, men of lofty ideals who gave not only the best that was in them, but the one supreme thing, life, for humanity; gave it without fear or reproach, sublime in the consciousness that their cause was just and that nature in her own good time would rehabilitate them and revere their memory.

ANARCHISTS OF AMERICA.

By WILLIAM HOLMES.

In "Anarchists of America," which appeared in *Collier's* for June 23rd, 1906, Broughton Blandenburg seems to have allowed his prejudices against an unpopular cause to so warp his judgment that an impartial or even an analytical treatment of his subject was quite out of the question. Instead of a rational, lucid explanation of Anarchism and revolutionary Socialism, showing the causes which produced these doctrines and submitting arguments to prove their fallacies and dangerous tendencies, we are treated to an unreasonable and somewhat hysterical diatribe, conspicuous for its

misleading statements, its unreliable statistics, its confessions of impotency in suggesting any remedy, and its general lack of fairness.

Anarchism and revolutionary Socialism are offered by their advocates as possible remedies for terrible evils inherent in our present social, political and industrial systems, which no one denies. Why not give them a fair hearing, and, if they are found demoralizing in principle or inadequate when reduced to practice, reject them and suggest something better? But why condemn them as villainous and murderous doctrines before investigating them? No one who has been a conscientious, painstaking student of social conditions and the remedies proposed by radical reformers will jeopardize his reputation for fair dealing by appeals to prejudice, by the use of misleading diagrams, or by statements of alleged facts which will not bear the test of honest investigation. No cause has ever been seriously damaged or effectively assisted by irrational or unfair treatment. Feeble-minded people or those with no minds of their own may for a time be frightened by lurid accounts (mostly taken from subsidized newspapers), of the doings and sayings of ultra radicals, but most readers of such periodicals as *Collier's* are also thinkers, and with them such vaporings have little weight.

Anarchism and revolutionary Socialism now count their followers by the tens of thousands, and tens of thousands are being added every year. Among them may be found leading scientists, famous authors and dramatists, noted artists and philanthropists. One of the foremost writers of America recently said: "All the best people one meets nowadays are Anarchists." Allowing for exaggeration on the part of an enthusiastic convert, it is yet absolutely true that hundreds of the brainiest and best people in this country and Europe are now found in the ranks of one or the other of these movements.

Anarchism as a theory of human society is now recognized by the lexicographers. The Century Dictionary defines Anarchism as: "A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man, by man, as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty."

The Americanized Encyclopedia Britannica, by Belfort-Clark Co., Chicago, 1890, Vol. X, page 6038, contains an accurate popular interpretation of Anarchism, from which the following extracts are taken:

"Anarchy is that system of voluntary Socialism—sometimes called individualism or mutualism—whose battle cry is 'Down with the State!' Its earliest exponent in America was Josiah Warren. He was an associate of Robert Dale Owen at New Harmony, Ind., where, in 1825, a Communist society was started under the most favorable auspices. But it was not until the failure of his experiment that Warren worked out his new principle of 'Cost the limit of price.' Mr. Warren maintains that labor expended forms the only equitable element in the cost of an article, and insists that all natural elements, such as land, should be free to all, and that interest on money should be abolished by issuing labor notes based on labor performed. His ideas are treated by Stephen Pearl Andrews in his work 'Science of Society.' Proudhon, the French economist, arrived at the same conclusions about the same time; the only difference between Warren and Proudhon is in the application of some of the details. . . . . Their economic demands consist of free land, free banking (through mutual organizations of credit) and free trade. The general assumption in the public mind that all Anarchists are in favor of applying physical force in furtherance of their ideas, is entirely erroneous."

Now it would seem that a cause thus dignified, however unpopular it may be, should be entitled at least to rational and just consideration by those who write about it. The intelligent reader may judge for himself whether I have been too severe in characterizing Mr. Brandenburg's article as illogical, misleading and unfair, by carefully noting the following brief analysis. We are told that:

"Anarchy and Revolutionary Socialism offer to honest but slow-witted labor a plausible, urgent reason for murder, robbery, immorality and civil disruption. The millions before whom we are helpless listen with growing interest."

Now, if this statement means anything, it is that Anarchism and Revolutionary Socialism are synonymous

with crime and moral debasement, which monstrous evils are so attractive to the laboring people that they "listen with growing interest" with a view to inaugurating a reign of terror sometime in the future. If this is not the meaning I should like to know what is. The "slow-witted" toilers of the country may or may not feel flattered by the opinions of Mr. Brandenburg, but patience has ever been considered a virtue by the class to which I belong, and it is not likely that others will protest.

Bearing in mind the construction Mr. Brandenburg placed upon the terms "Anarchy and Revolutionary Socialism," we are informed further that, "The principles of Anarchy appealed to Tolstoy as beautiful ideals." In this sentence the reader is led to infer that a doctrine which offers a "plausible, urgent reason for murder, robbery, immorality and civil disruption," is so attractive to the great Russian that he gladly accepts it as a beautiful ideal. Will the sentence, taken in connection with the questions given above, bear any other construction or interpretation? If so, I will be glad to be set right.

It is true that the principles of Anarchism appeal to Tolstoy as beautiful ideals—not because they offer incentives to crime, but because of something else—something which the writer in *Collier's* has not disclosed, something really beautiful and ennobling in the doctrine itself, which appeals not only to Tolstoy, but to all lovers of liberty and believers in human brotherhood, and which offers "a plausible, urgent reason" for a radical change in societary conditions.

Mr. Brandenburg's diagram and statistics are not altogether reliable, and in so far as they are incorrect are worthless as showing the real growth and present strength of the Anarchist movement. He has probably lent a too willing ear to "ghost stories" told him by over-zealous or humorously inclined radicals. It is doubtful if even the best informed Anarchists can give a fair estimate of the present number in the United States. It is plain to be seen that it would not be possible to do so unless they were enrolled in a single organization or in a system of federated groups with a central body, as they were prior to 1890. There is no

central organization, no federation of groups. The statement therefore that there are about 27,000 Anarchists in the United States is merely a guess, and like many guesses is liable to be very wide of the mark. But so certain is Mr. Brandenburg of the existence of groups of Anarchists in this country that he undertakes to state the number in several of the leading cities, and presents a map, indicating the group centres in different states. Now, I undertake to say, what every intelligent Anarchist knows to be true, that for the purpose for which this map is intended, it is absolutely worthless.

For instance, Denver, Colorado, is represented as having three groups, while on the map a string of dots extends thickly from Denver in the north to Trinidad in the extreme southern part of the state, the number of dots indicating eighteen or twenty groups in Colorado.

I challenge Mr. Brandenburg or any one else to prove that since 1890 there has been a single group of Anarchists in Denver or in any of the towns or cities in Colorado along the line of his dots from Denver to Trinidad. I will state here most emphatically that since the above date there has not been in existence in Colorado, a single group of Anarchists in any of the localities indicated on the wonderful map. It will be evident to the intelligent reader that a map which is so grossly inaccurate in one part may be and probably is misleading in other parts.

The fact of the mater is, that the numerical strength of Anarchism in this country cannot be shown in any such manner. Anarchist books and periodicals circulate everywhere, and the message is welcomed in thousands of homes where there is no thought of groups or organization. Nor does the movement depend for its increase upon immigration, this writer's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding, and therefore shutting out the discontented from other countries would not prevent the rapid growth of Anarchism. In fact, Anarchism cannot be stamped out of existence. To those who think it can, I would recall the prophetic warning of August Spies when he addressed the court in 1886:

"Here you will tread upon a spark, but here and there,

and behind you and in front of you and everywhere flames will blaze up. It is a subterranean fire. You cannot put it out."

Nothing can prevent the rapid spread of anarchistic doctrines. *Nothing, except putting a stop to the causes which make Anarchism possible.* And inasmuch as our rulers never think it necessary to go back to first principles it is not likely that this will be done.

It is distinctly true that Anarchism and scientific Socialism are revolutionary doctrines. What of it? This does not necessarily imply that the revolution *must* be by force. The change will come, to again quote Kropotkin: "Peaceful if peaceful it can be, insurrectional if the nation cannot break otherwise the privileges and monopolies bequeathed to it by its fathers." Remember, "*peaceful if peaceful it can be,*" and it rests entirely with the privileged classes in this as well as in other countries whether the peaceful efforts of the people shall continue to be thwarted and a resort to armed revolution be forced upon them.

But suppose it should come to an appeal to force. Is there something in the idea of revolution so dreadful to the liberty-loving American who boasts that by force his ancestors freed themselves and their descendants from kingly oppression? "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God," is an adage which applies to every age and every country. The evils complained of in the immortal Declaration of Independence, galling as they were to the colonists, were not to be compared to those suffered by the poor of every so-called civilized country on earth to-day. Look at Russia with her hordes of Cossacks, her knouts and her Siberian horrors! Look at Spain with her frightful dungeons and her nameless tortures! And yet, mild in comparison as were the indignities suffered by our forefathers, their protest first took the form of destruction of private property and other acts of agrarian outrage and ended in a violent revolution. Shall we, then, who boast that the liberties we now enjoy were wrung from King George by force of arms—shall we condemn any means taken by the suffering people of Spain or Russia to register their protest against the continuance of oppression and cruelty?

It is true, the American rebels did not resort to bomb throwing or direct assassination to gain their ends; but the conditions were far different from those which now prevail. Owing to their isolation from the home government and other causes, they were enabled to successfully rebel and proclaim to the world their freedom. In Spain and Russia the would-be rebels are crushed by the iron heel of their despotic rulers, from whom there is no escape. Armed rebellion and revolution by the common people as a mass may come in time; for the present they must protest, if they protest at all, by such means as may come into their power.

Resistance to invasion (simply another phrase for resistance to tyrants) is one of the cardinal teachings of Anarchism. The deed of Morales was distinctly an act of resistance to invasion. So was the destruction of tea in Boston harbor in 1776, and later the armed uprising at Lexington. The respective methods employed in either case had nothing to do with the matter. If it was right in 1776 to resist invasion by armed force and destruction of property, why is it wrong in 1906 to resist a thousand times worse invasion by attempting the lives of despots? Why should Americans praise one act and detest the other? Why should they grieve over the attempts to remove tyrants? In 1776, Washington and his noble colleagues were as much execrated by the Tories as Morales and Bresci are by average Americans to-day. If the colonial uprising had been a failure, Washington would have been hanged as a traitor and malefactor as surely as the Anarchist assassin would be executed to-day. In the face of these facts the cry that "Anarchists and Socialists who stand for the destruction or the establishment of any system except by the peaceable exertions of the will of the majority of the people, must be considered enemies of society—criminals—" is a fool's cry.

And shall we not stop to consider the psychological effect upon the down-trodden peasants of Spain and Russia, of the cruel policy of their rulers? Violence breeds more violence! Is it strange that the cruel, savage instincts of the rulers of these countries are reflected in the conduct of their unhappy subjects?

It is reported that three days after Morales threw

the bomb at the feet of the royal pair in Spain, the young queen, bright, happy and gay, attended a great bull fight at the amphi-theater in Madrid, and that she took pleasure in witnessing the cruel sport, waving her scarf as a signal for further bloodshed. We should not praise Morales' deed—of course not—; but wonder not if our detestation of his deed be modified when we consider the cruel nature of the people he sought to remove.

Radical changes involve great turbulence. This is a time of change in human governments as it is of physical upheavals. Violent upheavals, cataclysmic storms have been necessary to bring the earth and the institutions of men to their present state of efficiency. We can look for nothing different in the future. In the natural order of things turmoil must be expected. Anarchists and Revolutionary Socialists can no more be held responsible for this than can Quakers or Roman Catholics. Anarchism as a philosophy does not teach immorality; does not countenance crime, invasion or violence. Quite the contrary is true. If some Anarchists throw bombs and slay tyrannical rulers, does that prove that Anarchism *per se* is a wicked and dangerous doctrine? Many heinous crimes have been committed by devout Christians; yet no sensible person thinks of holding Christianity responsible. Booth was a Democrat, yet Democracy was not made responsible for his crime. Guiteau was a staunch Republican and a violent partisan, but no one thought of placing the blame for Garfield's murder upon the Republican party. Why then should Anarchism, which countenances violence and murder far less than Christianity, Republicanism or Democracy, be held responsible for the deeds of a few of its hot-headed or desperate partisans?

What of the assassination of an American president by Czolgosz? Simply this. Czolgosz was not an Anarchist in any sense of the term. This fact has been proved so often as to become tiresome by repetition. If he had been, the Anarchists of America would never have repudiated him, for the reason given above—that Anarchism, the only philosophy in the world which condemns all invasive acts in men, cannot justly be held responsible for deeds of invasive violence committed by any of its followers.

Anarchists did not invent the slaying of rulers. In every age and every clime, tyranny and oppression have breeded rebellion and revolt. Before Anarchists existed tyrants were slain; vengeance was dealt out to oppressors by their long-suffering victims.

In this connection and for the purpose of this article, I crave the privilege of a personal explanation. "Wicked and dangerous Anarchist" that I am, I am essentially a lover of peace, order and harmony. I abhor bloodshed and violence with an uncompromising detestation. I am opposed to invasion of every description, whether it takes the form of war, of public or private graft, of political corruption or social pollution. I am as bitterly opposed to the wholesale murder and maiming of railroad men, steel workers, miners and factory children by grasping, unscrupulous corporations as I am to the use of the knife and pistol in the hands of the individual assassin, and would hold all equally responsible. I make this statement so that there can be no mistake about my attitude toward crime and violence, and I know that all true Anarchists feel as I do. How many Republicans or Democrats can truthfully make this sweeping statement? How many professed followers of the meek and lowly Jesus can do likewise?

In conclusion, the times demand something far different from our public writers than confessions of impotency and inability to suggest a remedy for the alleged dangers of Anarchism and Revolutionary Socialism. If, "after years of investigation," Mr. Brandenburg "can hope to throw but a dim light" upon the situation, if he has come to the pessimistic conclusion that "there is little to do, little to recommend," it only goes to show that he has attempted to grapple with a subject that is far above him.

The "dangers" feared from the growth and spread of Anarchism and Revolutionary Socialism is no myth. It is real and grave. There is danger to despotic power, danger to merciless, unscrupulous corporations, danger to institutions that breed political dishonesty and public and private graft. These and similar debasing influences are marked for destruction and must be swept out of existence before mankind can be free. And this is the only danger, for to the great majority of the peo-

ple, the destruction of these monstrous evils will be a blessed boon.

I would earnestly recommend that Mr. Brandenburg cultivate in the proper spirit the acquaintance of well-informed radical thinkers, who will soon convince him that in order to deal intelligently and effectively with questions like these, he should study *causes*, place the responsibility upon them where it belongs and not upon mere effects. If we look far enough and deep enough we will always find that every effect has a cause. The irrational conduct of our public men, politicians, preachers, writers and others—in constantly dealing with effects and ignoring causes, is a deplorable thing, and constitutes one of the principal reasons for criticism of present conditions. Radical thinkers—Anarchists and Scientific Socialists—do not make this mistake. Delving deep into the motives for human conduct, they lay them bare before the world and apply the merciless scalpel of their logic to the shams of modern society.

❦ ❦ ❦

Dear Comrade:—In June last Collier's of New York published an article under the caption "Anarchists in America," by Broughton Brandenberg. As Collier's had previously declared themselves ready to publish both sides of every subject, however radical it might be, and the article in question was a most venomous, untruthful diatribe against revolutionary Socialists and Anarchists, I wrote the enclosed manuscript in reply and sent it to them. Of course, they returned it with the usual polite note of declination, and I am enclosing it herewith to you.

Yours for the Revolution,

WM. HOLMES.

❦ ❦ ❦

Comrade Holmes seems to believe in the infallibility of the Anarchists, as the Catholics do in that of the Pope, else he would not state that the Anarchists would never have repudiated Czolgosz, had the latter been known as an Anarchist. Even Anarchists are human and may err. However, it seems to us that the purpose of Anarchism is to explain all social phenomena, and not to condemn and sit in judgment.

THE EDITOR.

WHAT IS MORALITY?

By MARGARET GRANT.

"Right's right! that's one thing you can't get away from, Margaret."

It was my friend, Sarah Warner, who said that to me. Sarah is one of the bulwarks of society if anybody ever was one, but she has a way of exploding statements at you that leaves you with a stunned sense of having somehow been put in the wrong. Perhaps that is characteristic of the bulwark sort of person. I have noticed something of that kind in that splendid man, Theodore Roosevelt.

Now I had never said that right was not right, but there I was in the position of having been trying to get away from such a false statement.

"Why, Sarah," I cried warmly, "I am not trying to get away from it. Of course right is right."

"Well, I should think so," she returned, triumphantly uncompromising. "Right is right; it always has been so, and always will be so. I'm glad you admit it."

I don't know why it is that I always want to argue with Sarah, but I do; I think it is something in her way of saying things.

"Why, of course," I answered, "I know as well as you do that right is right, but perhaps it isn't always so easy to know what it is besides right."

"What do you mean by that, Margaret?" she demanded austerely. "Another of your dreadful subtelties, I suppose."

"Why, Sarah!" I replied in a grieved tone, "how can you say such a thing? I only mean that the right isn't always obvious."

"Morality is morality," she retorted curtly.

"Of course," I assented, "but what is morality?"

"What is morality?" she cried, aghast. "Well, I never!"

"Well, what is it?" I persisted.

"Huh!" she exclaimed, "as if there could be any doubt about it. Why, morality is—" She was going to say morality, but checked herself—"morality is—Well, I take my stand on the Bible."

"Both testaments?" I asked gently.

"Certainly; both testaments."

"Umm!" I murmured; "and do I understand you to mean that morality is the same to-day as yesterday? It doesn't change?"

"Why, Margaret!" she cried, "how can it change? Morality is morality. It is very simple."

"And there is only one kind of morality?" I asked.

"How can there be more than one kind? Haven't we the ten commandments? Are they not plain enough for anybody? And I am sure," she went on, half-closing her eyes and lowering her voice a little, "we can have no higher authority than God. He gave them to Moses with his own hand."

"Yes," I assented, "that is true; and they are endorsed by President Roosevelt, are they not?"

"Margaret!" she cried in that tone of reprehension that always startles me; "what are you talking about? Endorses them?"

"Well, discovered them, then," I cried in hasty correction of my mistake.

"Margaret," she said coldly, "sometimes I cannot make you out. But as to this question of morality, no one need be in any error with the ten commandments to guide him. The ten commandments and the Bible, of course."

"I suppose," I said, "that before Moses got the ten commandments there were no rules of morality; people used to lie and steal and murder and so on, and it was all right."

Sarah looked a trifle disturbed and doubtful, but I felt that I was on the right track at last, and so went eagerly on:

"Yes, Sarah," I said, "that must be right, for don't you remember how God told the Jews to take away from Egypt everything they could lay their hands on? And, of course, he wouldn't have done that if it had been wrong to steal, I am sure. No, of course you are right, there was no morality before Moses got the commandments."

"But, Margaret," she interposed hesitatingly, "I—I don't think I said that. To tell the truth, I don't think it ever occurred to me before what folks did before they had the ten commandments. But anyhow," she added

in a tone of deepest conviction, "after we got the commandments there was no reason for anyone to go wrong on the subject of morality."

"No-o," I answered, "not for those who got the commandments."

"What do you mean?" she demanded.

"Why, you know it was only the Jews who received the commandments; and, after all, there were only a few thousand of them; all the rest of the world just had to go on being immoral, I suppose; or should I say, unmoral?"

Sarah bridled and looked austere, as is her way when she is puzzled; then her face brightened up, and she cried out:

"I don't know what people did before they had the commandments, but after that, of course, there couldn't be any doubt, for the Jews anyhow; and really, it didn't make much difference about other people, since the Jews were chosen of God."

I wasn't quite sure what she meant by saying they were chosen of God, but I nodded my head. I was going to ask her why He hadn't chosen the Americans while He was about it, but what was the use of starting an argument about that before we had settled the question of morality?

"Certainly," I agreed; "and so the Jews were very moral after that."

"I presume there were bad Jews," she said swiftly.

"But anyhow," I went on, "ever since the commandments were given to Moses, morality has been the same?"

"How could it be otherwise? Morality is morality."

"You believe in polygamy then? Solomon had a thousand wives, you know," I suggested. "Or if you think Solomon overdid the matter a little, why there was David, who was a man after God's own heart. He not only had several wives, but there was that little episode of Uriah's wife. I don't believe we would condone an affair of that sort even in our precious Theodore."

"Pardon me, Margaret," Sarah said coldly, "but I do not care to discuss sacred matters in such a flippant way. It is not for me to criticise my Maker."

"Do you think I would have you criticise your Maker, Sarah?" I demanded reproachfully. "No, indeed! In fact, when I consider the matter, I don't know but I am inclined to agree with you that morality is the same to-day as it was in the good old biblical times. Don't you remember how the Lord used to put the enemies of the Israelites into their power and command them to smite them hip and thigh? I never did know just what it meant to smite them like that, though I don't think it meant to spank them. And how Jehovah would tell them to kill the women and the children? Isn't that just like us out there in the Philippines, when we got those wretches in the top of the extinct volcano and then murdered the women and children? Yes, Sarah, I think, as I study the matter that our morality is very much the same as that of the old Israelites."

"If you please, Margaret—" she began; but I interrupted.

"Then the way those old Israelites used to divorce their wives when they were tired of them! Talk about the divorce evil! Why—"

"Margaret! I will not have you use the Bible as a basis of—"

"Well, well!" I conceded, "perhaps you are right; perhaps it isn't fair. Do you remember what dear Dr. Parkhurst said about the old testament?"

"No, what did he say? It must have been something good and to the point."

"Yes," I replied, "it was very much to the point. I'll read it to you, for I cut it out of the newspaper at the time. Here it is: 'To the undiscriminating mind, anything is regarded as right for which any authority may be found anywhere within the lids of the Bible. If anyone wants to do a particular thing, adopt a custom or practice a habit, and can find nothing to sustain him in Mathew, he will turn to the old testament, and if nothing offers in the later portions he will go rummaging back to Chronicles and Kings, and keep retrograding until he finds a 'Thus saith the Lord,' addressed to people at a stage of civilization sufficiently backward and coarse to be on a level with himself, and therefore so far down as to be divinely allowed to do just the thing that he wants to do.'"

"Upon my word!" said Sarah.

"Yes," I agreed, "I don't believe it will be safe after all to go to the Bible for our moral examples; you are quite right, Sarah."

"But I didn't mean—"

"Of course you didn't mean to copy David or Solomon, or some of the other funny characters. I understand that. Perhaps Dr. Parkhurst is right after all and morals do change with time and place."

"Did he say that? Please read it again, Margaret! I can't believe—"

"And you know," I interrupted, "that there are people who say morals are a matter of geography."

"Now that's ridiculous, Margaret. Do you mean to tell me that murder can be right in one part of the earth when we all know it is wrong in itself, and therefore must be wrong anywhere. Murder is always wrong —must be."

"Murder wrong in itself, Sarah? Do you really think so?"

"Well!" she exclaimed scornfully, "I'd just like you to show me a case when it was right."

"Let me see!" said I, reflecting for a moment, "there is our noble Theodore who has a lien on the commandments, you know; didn't he cable his congratulations to our brave soldier boys when they shot down the women and babies in the old volcano?"

"That's war. Of course it's all right in war. Of course I'm sorry for the women and children but they shouldn't have been there. If people go to war they must expect to be killed."

"Women and children, too?"

"That's just an unfortunate incident of war; and if our noble president congratulated our soldiers on what they had done, I for one will believe that it was right the women and children should be killed."

"But you said murder was wrong in itself. If that be so how—"

"Now Margaret," she interposed severely, "I know very well that you are not in earnest. Of course people must be killed in war. Besides justified killing is not murder. For example, we must execute men who kill others."

"They used to kill them for stealing a loaf of bread."

"That was in barbarous times, of course. We don't do it now; not in this country anyhow."

"Out West they hang horse-thieves now."

"That's out West."

"But the people out there think they are justified."

"Perhaps they are; I'm sure I don't know."

"Then it may be a matter of geography, after all. But, of course, those wild westerners are not to be classed with our high-minded Puritan forefathers who had the most rigid notions of morality."

"Certainly not, Margaret. Ah! I am proud of being able to trace my descent from the early Puritans. The first of the—"

But I had heard the story of her pedigree, and interrupted her.

"Yes," I said, "they were fine. I have read how they came over here and first stole the land from the Indians and then hid behind trees and shot at them so as to get fifty dollars a piece for their scalps."

"Well," said Sarah, "the Indians had no use for the land, and they were so troublesome they simply had to be killed."

"Then murder isn't really wrong in itself it seems; nor theft either. For wasn't almost every foot of land in this country stolen from the Indians? Of course they were sometimes cheated of it in a sharp bargain, but that is the same as stealing."

"Now, Margaret, you know as well as I do that they were savages."

"So they were, Sarah," I assented. "They were savages and as such did not come under the same rules of morality as the Puritans. I begin to see better what your notion of murder is. When the white man shoots down naked savages that is civilization; when the meat-packers of Chicago send out poisonous food and three thousand of our soldiers are killed by it, according to General Miles, that is trade; when thousands of little children die each year from factory work, that is industry; when thousands of men die each year from preventable causes in mines, mills and railroads, that is commerce. I presume it is sure enough murder when a

poor wretch turns upon his industrial exploiter and strikes him down."

"You have a very specious way of putting it, Margaret, but you know as well as I do that, if civilization claims its victims, it is always for the good of society. Of course it is natural that workers should die in the hazardous occupations; we expect it. But consider the general welfare! As for the man who permits his own inefficiency to so sour his nature as to impel him to take the life of one whose only crime is that his native powers have brought him prosperity, why I have no words to sufficiently condemn his act."

"That settles the question of murder, then," I said; "and I suppose you are perfectly satisfied that murder is murder, the same now as it ever was?"

"Why, of course. Now, don't be cross because you have been worsted in the argument, Margaret."

"Well," I said, "it certainly looks to me as if somebody had the worst of the argument if you are right. It seems as if murder isn't murder when the State commits it, whether in the name of law or war; and it isn't murder when the capitalist commits it, whether in the factory, or the glass-works, or the mines or the mills or on the railroads; whether by sending out poisonous food under a lying label, by starving men, women and children with low wages, or by shooting them down when they strike for higher wages. From what I can make out, Sarah, murder is murder only when a wage slave, exploited by the capitalist, with all the force and power of the State behind him, becomes so maddened that he retorts upon violence with violence."

Sarah smiled in a superior way and began to pull her gloves on.

"You always become so unreasonable when you are beaten in an argument, Margaret. You would have been wiser if you had taken some other example of morality."

"And I think," said I, "that we would have been wiser to define morality in the beginning. We evidently have different ideas about it."

"Perhaps you would better define it, then," she said sarcastically.

"I am afraid I can't give a definition that will be ac-

cepted everywhere," I admitted. "Under a Christian civilization I find murder done in the name of religion, in the name of the State and in the name of industry. And you say it is not murder then. In some parts of Africa a man buries his father alive because he hasn't enough food for him and the old man is unable to procure it for himself."

"That is wicked murder," said Sarah indignantly.

"But both the son and the father think it mere humanity. You see it is the point of view. The same as it is with adultery, which the commandments say must not be committed. In some countries they call it adultery when a man pays a woman a price for the use of her body."

"I should think it was," snapped Sarah, feeling herself strong. "A woman who degrades herself to accept—"

"But in this and other Christian countries," I went on, disregarding her interruption, "that form of adultery is held in the highest esteem."

"How can you say such a thing, Margaret?"

"Why, Sarah, didn't you find fault with Kitty Smith for marrying John for love?"

"He hadn't a cent to his name."

"And didn't you say Mary Jones had done well when she married that old fossil who had made a fortune gambling in Wall Street?"

"He settled a million on her and gave her a magnificent house on Riverside Drive."

"Oh!" I murmured, and Sarah held her head up in the pride of vindicated respectability. "Well," I went on, "in Thibet it is considered entirely proper for one woman to have several husbands, while in other parts it is equally correct for one man to have several wives."

"It is needless to go on," Sarah interrupted in a shocked tone; "there is but one correct way—the Anglo-Saxon way."

"It is certainly interesting," I admitted; "the pretence of monogamy in the midst of real polygamy; buying a woman with a house and lot for the respectable and acknowledged wife, and maintaining mistresses and houses of prostitution on the side, as the men say."

"I cannot remain to listen to such attacks upon our

most sacred institution, Margaret," said Sarah, rising with dignity. "Pardon me if I say good afternoon at once. Sometimes I think you would undermine the commandments even."

"But I would like to say something about lying and stealing, Sarah."

"I hope you are not going to try to make them out right, Margaret," she said, closing her lips firmly.

"No indeed, Sarah. The truth is that I am in doubt about what lying and stealing are."

"Ridiculous. Stealing is taking what doesn't belong to you, and lying is saying what you know to be untrue. It is very simple."

"And is it always wrong to lie and steal?"

"Margaret! Of course it is, and you know it."

"Then when our splendid president took Panama—"

"Margaret, you know that had to be done, or we would never have had our canal. It was magnificent in him to do that."

"Yes, I have heard that if you really steal enough it isn't stealing. What fine men Rockefeller and Morgan and Harriman and Rogers and Ryan and all those life insurance and railroad and oil men are. How magnificent! It isn't stealing when they make illegal combinations to get control of the goods of the little wretches, or when they rig the market and play a "sure thing" game with the money of widows and orphans and silly little honest men. And there is no lying done when Standard Oil goes into court. The rules on lying and stealing only apply to the poor people, so that the monopoly in those articles of morality may remain with them as a sort of consolation prize, I suppose, for the monopolies that are vested in our ruling class."

"Margaret!"

"Oh, I know what you are going to say, Sarah; and you are right, of course: What would become of our captains of industry if they couldn't perjure themselves in court, but had to tell the truth like common workmen? Trade would be ruined and industry at a standstill. Even buying judges and senators and whole houses of legislatures wouldn't help them to maintain their proud supremacy if they had to tell the truth like common people. And if they could not steal! Well,

where would the oil industry be? Where would the coal come from? What should we do for our daily papers if our forests could not be stolen under our eyes? Oh, you are quite right, Sarah; and I begin to see with you that our whole system of civilization as well as our magnificent industrial system, to say nothing of our beautiful and beneficent governmental system would shrivel and crumble until nothing was left of any of them, if our ruling class was held to the same code of morals. No, Sarah, you are altogether right; I see it now; morality is a beautiful device of the ruling class for the better exploitation of the simple-minded but useful worker."

"Margaret Grant," screamed Sarah, quite purple in the face, "I never said such a thing; and I would thank you not to put words in my mouth."

And she slammed the door!

❦ ❦ ❦

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

Likewise, when certain economists tell us that "in a perfectly free market the price of commodities is measured by the amount of labor socially necessary for their production," we do not take this assertion on faith because it is made by certain authorities or because it may seem to us "tremendously socialistic." It may be so, we say. But do you not notice that by this very statement you maintain that value and the necessary labor are proportional to each other—just as the speed of a falling body is proportional to the number of seconds it has been falling? Thus you maintain a quantitative relation between these two magnitudes; whereas a quantitative relation can be proved only by quantitative measureents. To confine yourself to the remark that the exchange-value of commodities "generally" increases when a greater expenditure of labor is required, and then to assert that, therefore, the two quantities are proportional to each other, is to make as great a mistake as the man who would assert that the quantity of rainfall is measured by the fall of the barometer below its average height. He who first observed that, generally speaking, when the barometer is falling a greater amount of rain falls than when it is rising; or, that there

is a certain relation between the speed of a falling stone and the height from which it fell—that man surely made a scientific discovery. But the person who would come after him and assert that the amount of rainfall is measured by the fall of the barometer below its average height, or that the space through which a falling body has passed is proportional to the time of fall and is measured by it,—that person would not only talk nonsense, but would prove by his very words that the method of scientific research is absolutely strange to him; that his work is unscientific, full as it may be of scientific expressions. The absence of data is, clearly, no excuse. Hundreds, if not thousands, of similar relationships are known to science in which we see the dependence of one magnitude upon another—for example, the recoil of a cannon depending upon the quantity of powder in the charge, or the growth of a plant depending upon the amount of heat or light received by it; but no scientific man will presume to affirm the proportionality of these magnitudes without having investigated their relations quantitatively, and still less would he represent this proportionality as a scientific law. In most instances the dependence is very complex—as it is, indeed, in the theory of value. The necessary amount of labor and value are by no means proportional.

The same remark refers to almost every economic doctrine that is current to-day in certain circles and is being presented with wonderful naivety as an invariable law. We not only find most of these so-called laws grossly erroneous, but maintain also that those who believe in them will themselves become convinced of their error as soon as they come to see the necessity of verifying their quantitative deductions by quantitative investigation.

Moreover, the whole of political economy appears to us in a different light from that in which it is seen by modern economists of both the middle-class and the Social Democratic camps. The scientific method (the method of natural scientific induction) being utterly unknown to them, they fail to give themselves any definite account of what constitutes " a law of nature," although they delight in using the term. They do not know—

or if they know they continually forget—that every law of nature has a conditional character. It is always expressed thus: "If certain conditions in nature meet, certain things will happen." "If one line intersects another, forming right angles on both sides of it, the consequences will be these or those." If two bodies are acted upon by such movements only as exist in interstellar space, and there is no third body within measurable distance of them, then their centres of gravity will approach each other at a certain speed (the law of gravitation)." And so on. In every case there is an "if"—a condition.

In consequence of this, all the so-called laws and theories of political economy are in reality no more than statements of the following nature: "Granting that there are always in a country a considerable number of people who cannot subsist a month, or even a fortnight, without accepting the conditions of work imposed upon them by the State, or offered to them by those whom the State recognizes as owners of land, factories, railways, etc., then the results will be so and so."

So far middle-class political economy has been only an enumeration of what happens under the just-mentioned conditions—without distinctly stating the conditions themselves. And then, having described the facts which arise in our society under these conditions, they represent to us these facts as rigid, inevitable economic laws. As to Socialist political economy, although it criticises some of these deductions, or explains others somewhat differently,—it has not yet been original enough to find a path of its own. It still follows in the old grooves, and in most cases repeats the very same mistakes.

And yet, in our opinion, political economy, must have an entirely different problem in view. It ought to occupy with respect to human society a place in science similar to that held by physiology in relation to plants and animals. It must become the physiology of society. It should aim at studying the needs of society and the various means, both hitherto used and available under the present state of scientific knowledge, for their satisfaction. It should try to analyze how far the present means are expedient and satisfactory, economic

or wasteful; and then, since the ultimate end of every science (as Bacon had already stated) is obviously its practical application to life, it should concern itself with the discoveries of means for the satisfaction of these needs with the smallest possible waste of labor and with the greatest benefit to mankind in general. Such means would be, in fact, mere corollaries from the relative investigation mentioned above, provided this last had been made on scientific lines.

It will be clear, even from the hasty hints given already, why it is that we come to conclusions so different from those of the majority of economists, both of the middle class and the Social Democratic schools; why we do not regard as "laws" certain of the temporary relations pointed out by them; why we expound Socialism entirely differently; and why, after studying the tendencies and developments in the economic life of different nations, we come to such radically different conclusions as regards that which is desirable and possible; why we come to Free Communism, while the majority of Socialists arrive at State-capitalism and Collectivism.

Perhaps we are wrong and they are right. But in order to ascertain who is right, it will not do either to quote this and that authority, to refer to Hegel's trilogy, or to argue by the "dialectic method." This question can be settled only by taking up the study of economic relations as facts of natural science.*

---

* A few extracts from a letter written by a renowned Belgian biologist and received when these lines were in print, will help me to make my meaning clearer by a living illustration. The letter was not intended for publication, and therefore I do not name its author: "The further I read [such and such a work]—he writes—the surer I become that nowadays only those are capable of studying economic and social questions who have studied the natural sciences and *have become imbued with their spirit.* Those who have received only a so-called classical education are no longer able to understand the present intellectual movement and are equally incapable of studying a mass of social questions. . . . . The idea of the integration of labor and of *division of labor in time only* [the idea that it would be expedient for society to have every person cultivating the land and following industrial and intellectual pursuits in turn, thus varying his labor and becoming a variously-developed individual] will become in time one of the corner-stones of economic science. A number of biological facts are in harmony with the thought just underlined, which shows that we are here dealing with a law of nature [that in nature, in other words, an economy of forces may frequently result in this way]. If we examine the vital functions of any living being at different periods of its life, and even at different times of the year, and sometimes at different moments of the day, we find the application of the division of labor in time, which is inseparably connected with the division of labor among the different organs (the law of Adam Smith).

"Scientific people unacquainted with the natural sciences, are frequently unable to understand the true meaning of *a law* of nature; the word *law* blinds them, and they imagine that laws, like that of Adam Smith,

Pursuing the same method, Anarchism arrives also at its own conclusions concerning the State. It could not rest content with current metaphysical assertions like the following: "The State is the affirmation of the idea of the highest Justice in Society;" or "The State is the instigation and the instrument of progress;" or "without the State, society is impossible." Anarchism has approached the study of the State exactly in the manner the naturalist approaches the study of social life among bees and ants, or among the migratory birds which hatch their young on the shores of sub-arctic lakes. It would be useless to repeat here the conclusions to which this study has brought us with reference to the history of the different political forms (and to their desirable or probable evolution in the future); if I were to do so, I should have to repeat what has been written by Anarchists from the time of Godwin, and what may be found, with all necessary explanations, in a whole series of books and pamphlets.

I will say only that the State is a form of social life which has developed in our European civilization, under the influence of a series of causes,* only since the end of the sixteenth century. Before the sixteenth century the State, in its Roman form, did not exist—or, more exactly, it existed only in the minds of the historians who trace the genealogy of Russian autocracy to Rurik and that of France to the Merovingian kings.

Furthermore, the State (State-Justice, State-Church, State-Army) and Capitalism are, in our opinion, inseparable concepts. In history these institutions developed side by side, mutually supporting and re-enforcing each other. They are bound together, not by a mere coin-

---

have a fatalistic power from which it is impossible to rid oneself. When they are shown the *reverse* side of this last—the sad results of individualism, from the point of view of development and personal happiness,—they answer: *this is an inexorable law*, and sometimes they give this answer so off-handedly that they thereby betray their belief in a kind of infallibility. The naturalist, however, knows that science can paralyze the harmful consequences of a *law;* that frequently he who goes against nature wins the victory.

"The force of gravity compels bodies *to fall*, but it also compels the balloon *to rise*. *To us* this seems so clear; but the economists of the classical school appear to find it difficult to understand the full meaning of this observation.

"*The law of the division of labor in time* will counterbalance the law of Adam Smith, and will permit the integration of labor to be reached by every individual."

* An analysis of which may be found—say—in the pamphlet, "The State and its Historic Rôle" (*Freedom* pamphlets).

cidence of contemporaneous development, but by the bond of cause and effect, effect and cause. Thus, the State appears to us as a society for the mutual insurance of the landlord, the warrior, the judge, and the priest, constituted in order to enable every one of them to assert his respective authority over the people and to exploit the poor. To contemplate the destruction of Capitalism without the abolition of the State—though the latter was created solely for the purpose of fostering Capitalism and has grown up alongside of it—is just as absurd, in our opinion, as it is to hope that the emancipation of the laborer will be accomplished through the action of the Christian church or of Cæsarism. Many Socialists of the thirties and forties, and even the fifties, hoped for this; but for us, who have entered upon the twentieth century, it is ridiculous to cherish such hopes as this!

X.

It is obvious that, since Anarchism differs so widely in its method of investigation and in its fundamental principles, alike from the academical sociologists and from its social-democratic fraternity, it must of necessity differ from them all in its means of action.

Understanding Law, Right, and the State as we do, we cannot see any guarantee of progress, still less of a social revolution, in the submission of the Individual to the State. We are therefore no longer able to say, as do the superficial interpreters of social phenomena, that modern Capitalism has come into being through "the anarchy of exploitation," through "the theory of non-interference," which—we are told—the States have carried out by practicing the formula of "let them do as they like" (laissez faire, laissez passer). We know that this is not true. While giving the capitalist any degree of free scope to amass his wealth at the expense of the helpless laborers, the government has nowhere and never during the whole nineteenth century afforded the laborers the opportunity "to do as they pleased." The terrible revolutionary, that is, Jacobinist, convention legislated: "For strikes, for forming a State within the State—death!" In 1819 people were hanged in England for going out on strike, and in 1831 they were deported to Australia for forming the Great Trades' Union

(Union of all Trades) of Robert Owen; in the sixties people were still condemned to hard labor for participating in strikes, and even now, in 1902, trade unions are prosecuted for damages amounting to half a million dollars for picketing—for having dissuaded laborers from working in times of strike. What is one to say, then, of France, Belgium, Switzerland (remember the massacre at Airolo!), and especially of Germany and Russia? It is needless, also, to tell how, by means of taxes, the State brings laborers to the verge of poverty which puts them body and soul in the power of the factory boss; how the communal lands have been robbed from the people, and are still robbed from them in England by means of the Enclosure Acts. Or, must we remind the reader how, even at the present moment, all the States, without exception, are creating directly (what is the use of talking of "the original accumulation" when it is continued at the present time!) all kinds of monopolies—in railroads, tramways, telephones, gas-works, water works, electric works, schools, etc., etc. In short, the system of non-interference—the laissez faire—has never been applied for one single hour by any government. And therefore, if it is permissible for middle-class economists to affirm that the system of non-interference" is practiced (since they endeavor to prove that poverty is a law of nature), it is simply shameful that socialists should speak thus to the workers. Freedom to oppose exploitation has so far never and nowhere existed. Everywhere it had to be taken by force, step by step, at the cost of countless sacrifices. "Non-interference," and more than non-interference—direct support; help and protection—existed only in the interests of the exploiters. Nor could it be otherwise. The mission of the church has been to hold the people in intellectual slavery; the mission of the State was to hold them, half starved, in economic slavery.

Knowing this, we cannot see a guarantee of progress in a still greater submission of all to the State. We seek progress in the fullest emancipation of the Individual from the authority of the State; in the greatest development of individual initiative and in the limitation of all the governmental functions, but surely not in the extension thereof. The march forward in political institu-

tions appears to us to consist in abolishing, in the first place, the State authority which has fixed itself upon society (especially since the sixteenth century), and which now tries to extend its functions more and more; and, in the second place, in allowing the broadest possible development for the principle of free government, and in acknowledging the independence of all possible associations formed for definite ends, embracing in their federations the whole of society. The life of society itself we understand, not as something complete and rigid, but as something never perfect—something ever striving for new forms, and ever changing these forms in accordance with the needs of the time. This is what life is in Nature.

Such a conception of human progress and of what we think desirable in the future (what, in our opinion, can increase the sum of happiness) leads us inevitably to our own special tactics in the struggle. It induces us to strive for the greatest possible development of personal initiative in every individual and group, and to secure unity of action, not through discipline, but through the unity of aims and the mutual confidence which never fail to develop when a great number of persons have consciously embraced some common idea. This tendency manifests itself in all the tactics and in all the internal life of every Anarchist group, and so far we have never had the opportunity of seeing these tactics fail.

(*To be continued.*)

APHORISMS.

By J. M. GOTTESMAN.

Governments fall through the same methods by which they have acquired their power.

Great events come unexpectedly. The tongue of the balance of destiny is at a standstill in times of equilibrium: one more grain, and the movement has been determined.

A LETTER FROM RUSSIA.

Comrades and Lovers of Liberty: Being occupied with the struggle in Russia—absorbed in the propaganda of anarchistic ideas and in practical anarchist activity, the Russian Anarchists have had hardly any opportunity to enter into a close relationship with their foreign comrades and to acquaint them with the character and the course of their work—with the course and development of the Russian Anarchist movement. Meanwhile the foes and the opponents of our ideas have neglected no opportunity—favorable or unfavorable—to slander us or to besmirch us. The capitalistic press of the whole world takes up the calumnies and spreads them broadcast, telling *urbi et orbi* of the "dreadful crimes of the terrible anarchists," who are nothing but organized "thieves, robbers and common murderers." Frequently such "news" has been reproduced in Socialistic organs; or they have indulged in vagaries of their own imaginative powers on the subject of the "immoral and dreadful conduct" of the Russian Anarchists. It is saddening, yet we must admit that such agitation against the Russian Anarchists has found some echo in the hearts of the readers; and when some of the Russian Anarchists have happened to meet American comrades, they have found many of them completely ignorant of the Russian Anarchist movement, and therefore have behaved unsympathetically towards their Russian comrades. We have observed this fact with aching hearts; for, being hounded in all countries, persecuted on all sides, and having against us not only the dominating bourgeois class of the whole world, but also the would-be Socialists of all countries, hating us as the irreconcilable critics of expiring "Socialism," we can be strong only by coming nearer together and by mutual helpfulness; and so should particularly value international solidarity and mutual understanding. We must understand each other and know each other, and we, the Russian Anarchists, so far the youngest in the international Anarchist family, are now anxious to repair the damage done by their negligence, by giving you an insight into the state and condition of our movement in Russia. And we hope that these statements, based upon facts regarding the activity of the Russian Anarchists, will dispel the fog of prejudice in which a hostile press has enveloped us.

As we all know, the Anarchist movement in Russia was quite strong at the end of the '60s and the beginning of the '70s. The idea of Bakunin dominated the minds of the Socialist revolutionary youth, and found expression in the revolutionary literature as well as in the practical activities of the popular Socialists (Narodniki). Even those who confessed centralistic and governmental views yielded to these influences to a certain extent; but in the beginning of the '80s there was a reaction in the Russian revolutionary movement. Anarchistic views were supplanted by German metaphysical and Social-Democratic governmental opinions. The interruption of the Anarchist propaganda and activity continued for about thirty years. Only at the beginning of the twentieth century a new and young movement has come to life. Its revival and rise coincided with the recrudescence and growth of the revolutionary spirit in general and of the revolutionary aspirations among the working masses.

The first Anarchist groups appeared approximately during the summer of 1903 in west and south Russia. It is difficult now, owing to the scarcity of the necessary material, to trace the beginning of the movement accurately. It undoubtedly developed under many different historical influences. The connections between this new movement and that of the '60s and '70s can hardly be traced, if there be a connection at all. Social Democracy as well as this modern Anarchism were both imported into Russia as products of Western European civilization. The Russian Socialists and revolutionists who emigrated from Russia, acquainted themselves in the west with anarchistic ideas and anarchistic movements. Many of them became Anarchists, and on returning to Russia, became the apostles of these new ideas, which found in Russia a rich and fertile soil among the workingmen, especially in the cities, and also among the intelligent Socialist youth.

The soil had been prepared by the deeds of that most reprehensible of all governments, the autocracy; many lost faith in government in general; the working masses began to realize their economic slavery—their determination to secure economic freedom clearly manifesting itself in the great general strike of 1903. The masses were dissatisfied with the exclusively political activity of the

Social Democratic party; many and strong were the protests of the workingmen against the tendency towards centralization and dictatorship on the part of the Social Democratic and Social revolutionary leaders and the so-called "committee-men."

The common Russian loves freedom and independence instinctively and the strict discipline—nay, almost military severity—and the complete subordination to the all-powerful party leader, to which the German workers readily submit, were in Russia the main cause of the continual misunderstandings and dissensions in the organizations of the Socialist parties. In some cities, the workers would cut loose from the "center" of the Socialist organizations and form their own independent organizations in order to uphold their right of initiative and of spontaneous activity. These protests sometimes assumed the character of a widespread movement resulting in decentralizations and in the formation of entirely independent organizations; as for instance the Workers' Freedom party. This rebellion against party discipline among the masses and some of the intelligent leaders is a very interesting phenomenon in the history of the Russian revolutionary movement, which, however, cannot be discussed here. Yet it is one of the main causes of the rapid development, among the masses, of anarchistic ideas of individual freedom.

Such was the soil in which the imported ideas of Anarchism of Western Europe developed. How favorable this soil was can be estimated by the rapid spread of Anarchist ideas. The first Anarchist group appeared in Bielostock in 1903, and at the end of 1905 there was already a web of groups over an enormous part of Russia —west, south and north. To enumerate here all the towns in which these groups were doing work would take up too much space. We will therefore give only a brief summary of our larger centers and more or less important cities in the different provinces, viz.: St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kieff, Nikolaieff, Odessa, Riga, Warsaw, Bielostock, Vilna, Kovna, Tomboff, Zhitomir, Berditsheff, Elisabethgrad, Ekaterinoslov, Simferopol, in the Caucasus in numerous cities and towns grouped around the larger centers. In the Chernigoff and partly in the Vilna provinces the Anarchist propaganda got hold even of the

villages of the peasantry. In all the enumerated places the Anarchist groups were more or less bold and active. Here and there these groups were weakened temporarily through persecutions, but were again strengthened by the influx of new forces. In some cities the Anarchist organizations assumed such dimensions that it became necessary to scatter them into federated groups, as for instance in Odessa and Bielostock.

In January and February of the current year the growth of Anarchism was somewhat checked, nay, suffered even a loss, due to the prevailing reaction in the country; but the opening of the Duma and the revival of life in general, enlivened for some time the Anarchist movement again. However, since Stolypin's régime of "reform with an iron hand" has held sway in Russia, the exact condition of our movement cannot be indicated.

It is hardly possible to embrace all sides of the activities of the different groups in a brief sketch. That would mean to write a history of the Anarchist movement in Russia, which, notwithstanding its youth, would require so much time and effort for the preliminary work of collecting documents and other material, that we cannot think of such a thing during this struggling period of revolutionary activity. We are therefore compelled to confine ourselves to brief and general characteristics of the movement.

Although the revival of the Anarchist movement in Russia can with greater or less probability be traced to the year 1903, its active and vigorous work dates only after the January days of 1905. To understand the character of this activity, the circumstances under which it developed must not be lost sight of. From the well known "red Sunday" of January 22d, the revolution assumed a new phase in its development. The working masses in the cities became its active champions, who, guided by their healthy popular instinct, made their economical demands their foremost issue. Spreading from city to city, in the spring and the beginning of the summer, the revolution seized also the peasantry and brought on the scene of this historical movement, the interesting figure of the Russian "mushik" with his invariable and persistent demand for "the land." The political parties, the Social Democrats as well as the Socialist

Revolutionists played no leading part at the beginning of the revolution among the masses, notwithstanding the fact that they pretended to be "their only representatives." Still, they were not slow in taking advantage of the achievements of the revolution, endeavoring to steer the same into a political movement in favor of a legislative assembly on the basis of universal and equal suffrage. The different factions of the liberals came also into line, with greater splendor, however, representing the so-called "flower of the nation," their demands being approximately the same as those of the Socialist parties. Thus the purely democratic demands pressed all others more and more into the background, and the revolutionaries, especially in the cities—got closer and closer around the *democratic banner.* The pernicious result of such fusion made itself felt already on October 30, when the manifesto granting a "constitution" and merely making some political promises, was accepted as a satisfactory achievement of the revolution.

And the Anarchists? Well, they acted like "true utopians." They proclaimed that the revolution—being carried on by the masses—should be continued in the interest of the masses. Having been taught a lesson by the stern experiences of the West, the Anarchists understood that political freedom under economical slavery was naught else but a fatal delusion. Having the history of the past before them, they pointed out to the workers the deception that is back of the noisy and boastful watchwords like "freedom," "equality," and "fraternity," to be realized under a government of the middle class. To be sure, their task was a difficult one, and Democracy again had its bacchanalian feasts and the intoxication became general. But by their incessant work the Anarchists succeeded in sobering the workers to a greater or less extent, for which they became the object of hatred of the Democrats of all shades. Dirt and slander was heaped upon the people who dared to create discord in the general harmony of the alluring voices of deceit.

However, the Anarchists did not confine themselves merely to negative criticism, but pointing out to the workers what ought to be done instead of indulging in political tomfoolery; remaining true to their ideas and aspirations of human welfare, they proclaimed the

seizure of the necessities of life. Here we must not forget that the Anarchists did not succeed in establishing their own press in Russia, and so their propaganda and agitation were confined to circulars and proclamations, in which the masses were called upon to rid themselves of all authority and exploitation and to depend only upon themselves in arranging their economical and social affairs independent of any political parties.

All this was, of course, not to the liking of our politicians of the different colors and shades. They wanted, above all else, a legislative assembly, which would, so they promised, occupy itself also with economical reforms. But we know what these assemblies accomplish. We remember what the National Assembly in France did for the Revolution in 1789, and what, after that, the renowned Directory achieved. Could we forget the thoughtfulness in behalf of the workers of the temporary or revolutionary government of 1848, in which even Socialists participated? Oh, we were well aware of all this, and therefore we persistently appealed to the Russian masses: "Seize the land—the factories; rely only upon yourselves, otherwise you will remain in slavery, changed only in its form."

The work of propaganda and agitation was accompanied by a terroristic activity in which both the professional and industrial workers took part. It is impossible, however, to enumerate all the terroristic deeds which were committed or to mention the many reasons which caused such acts. Vengeance for the arbitrary arrests of comrades, the cruel clubbing and flogging of the people, the revolting outrages perpetrated upon a whole population, etc., are some of the reasons which caused these terroristic deeds. Direct attacks upon the police and gendarmery were also frequent occurrences. But the Anarchists did not limit their activity to political terror. Their struggle against capitalism—the exploiters—was not less fierce. The success achieved in the economic struggle was largely due to the energetic activity of the Anarchists, who thereby gained the sympathy and confidence of the workers. Thus the soil for our ideas was enriched considerably. We looked upon these economic struggles as one of the means to prevent the revolution from being shifted into a purely political channel and to

enable the workers to strengthen their position in this struggle for complete economic and political liberation.

The question of "expropriation" which caused so much noise all over the world and gave our enemies a chance to spread false reports and to discredit the Russian Anarchists, figured prominently in our propaganda work. We shall endeavor to explain our position briefly. Under the term "expropriation" we understand the confiscation of property by organized groups for the benefit of our propaganda. The Social Democrats who looked upon autocracy as their only enemy and accordingly went side by side with the middle classes, expropriated only government property, as has been shown by the practices of the Social Democrats as well as the Socialist Revolutionists. The Anarchists, however, starting out from the point of view that the revolution must be a struggle of the entire body of the oppressed toilers against all the ruling and exploiting classes, pointed out to the workers that both the government and capitalism were equally dangerous and should make no distinction between government property and that of capitalists. The money was "expropriated" from both the government and capitalists for propaganda purposes. Such tactics of confiscating private property were also employed by the Young Socialist Revolutionists who had cut loose from the old party of Socialist Revolutionists.

But, we are sorry to say, grave mistakes could not be averted. Many comrades sought to create sentiment against property in the revolutionary movement by propaganda of *individual* expropriation, carried out by the individual at his own risk, disposing of such money according to his own notions. They thought to strike at the deep-rooted reverence for private property among the masses—a prejudice which is even fostered by our would-be Socialist parties; to dispel belief in the inviolability of property, thus making it the starting point of the socialization of all property. These views were upheld by "Without Government," a paper coming from Paris. The results showed that this was a mistaken view. "Individual expropriation" had its attractiveness and was carried on in a rather broad measure, turning away from the field of propaganda many active forces, leading the weaker element into corruption. To the great delight of

the Social Democrats, adventurers and other obscure characters also robbed and plundered in the name of Anarchism, giving the reformer an opportunity to attribute all robbery to the Anarchists, thus trying to discredit the latter in the eyes of the masses; and when the revolutionary chaos combined with a general crisis and a terrible want of employment increased the individual violations of property considerably, the moral tenderness of our Socialists found plenty of material for the outpouring of its indignation against the Anarchists. Here, then (as well as in the capitalistic press), is the source of the stories regarding the robberies and other crimes of the Anarchists, in which they are stigmatized as a "band of appropriators." The Russian public, however, paid but little attention to these tales; they were more or less familiar with Anarchism and the doings of the Anarchists. They distinguished the blunders of the Anarchists from the unprincipled acts of adventurers and common thieves. But, unfortunately, outside of Russia, these tales found a hearing. We hope, though, the outside world will also have its eyes opened after it has learned to look upon our movement in its true light.

We have been compelled to be brief and so could neither stop to consider the voluminous literature, which has been issued in Russia during this short period, nor speak of the periodicals which were smuggled into the country. Nor can we in this brief sketch discuss those characteristic tendencies which marked the Anarchist movement, or touch those points which divided the Anarchists to a certain extent. This we shall try to do in a series of articles on Russian Anarchism later on. But in conclusion we would like to say to our comrades a few words of a practical character.

The Russian revolution has evoked enthusiasm in the whole world, and a readiness to help the struggle along among the oppressed and humiliated in all countries. To them it sounds like a call to arms for their own liberation. That they look upon it as their own bloody battle has been clearly shown by the sympathy and solidarity of the toiling masses of all countries. But the distortions of the press are also the cause of the hazy attitude of many towards the revolution. A great many people cannot distinguish the different tendencies in the revolution which

struggle against each other, but look upon it as a collective movement, and that is why we have tried to point out its different currents.

We have indicated that there are principally two tendencies struggling against the present régime; the one, authoritarian, is supported by all political parties, and the other, a national movement, which the Anarchists have joined. The former is consciously and unconsciously endeavoring to wield a new power over the people, politically and economically, changing only its form, while the latter is instinctively aiming at the complete emanicipation of the individual from all shackles of authority. This instinctive tendency the Anarchists are trying to inculcate with consciousness and truth. Now, everybody must decide for himself which of these movements he thinks worthy of his sympathy and support. Everybody should remember that, if up to the present time the politicians have held the reins of the revolution more or less in their hands, the greater should be the efforts of the true friends of the people to direct all their strength and energy towards the support of the people's movement.

This task the Russian Anarchists have undertaken. True, so far they are unfortunately still in the minority and their task is a hard one, but that should not prevent anyone from sympathizing with them. Being fully aware of the dire necessity and gravity of our work, and hoping that we shall enjoy the sympathy of all those who are striving for the beautiful ideal of the freedom of the individual, we appeal in the name of Russian Anarchists to all liberty-loving people to help the Russian Anarchist movement financially and morally. Many urgent needs which have grown out of the movement must be complied with, such as the publishing of literature, helping those who languish in prison and in Siberia, and supporting those who are carrying on the propaganda all over the country. The most urgent need, however, is the revival of our periodical. For almost nine months Anarchist propaganda has been carried on without an organ of its own, having suspended the existing periodicals for practical reasons. But their absence has proven to be a great drawback to the development of our theoretical and practical ideas. Many problems require re-examination

and criticism in order to reach clearness and cohesion. Our first task shall be to establish a periodical to serve the theoretical and practical requirements of the movement.

Comrades, you who are connected with the Anarchist movement in different countries, you who are convinced that Anarchism alone can solve the world's problem of social injustice, you will surely recognize the necessity of the Anarchist propaganda in Russia. You cannot help sympathizing with us in our efforts to spread, also in Russia, the ideas for which you struggle and suffer. Will you deny Anarchism the right of existence in Russia? Will you refuse to help your comrades in Russia, so long as they are still weak and in need of your support? Will you withhold your aid from the spreading of your ideal in a country which has given you the foremost philosophers of Anarchism and its greatest advocates? We expect an answer from you.

L. LEVIN.
J. LYONS.

We hope that those who read the above letter will appreciate the great difficulty the spread of Anarchism is confronted with in Russia. We therefore appeal for financial assistance, liberal and immediate.

All contributions to be sent to Russian Fund, care of "Mother Earth."

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

RUSSIA.

Now that the exaltation of spirit following the first detonations of the Russian revolution has had time to equilibrate itself, Anarchists throughout the world are beginning to inquire more precisely into the probable extent and possibilities of it, and into their own attitude towards it. Almost every one of our exchanges has a considerable article devoted to this one great social phenomenon, weekly or monthly, as the case may be. And all tend to the same observation, viz.: that events are disillusionizing those who saw in it the forerunner of any great social revolution. The Social Democracy becomes ever more and more timid in its methods, while the Social Revolutionary party limits its warfare to the autoc-

racy and its representatives, i. e., to a warfare upon the existing political form. The economic problem is comparatively shelved, while the Socialists wage the battle of Republicans, constitutional monarchists, the bourgeoisie and what not. As to the hopeful signs seen in the erstwhile frequent revolts and mutinies of soldiers and sailors, it appears that these were very largely nothing more than local protests against local conditions, such as unusual punishments, under-feeding, etc., and not any widespread consciousness of the essential iniquity of militarism. So far the Russian Anarchists themselves have been but little heard from outside of Russia. This is principally because they have had so much to do to allow them to talk. The Socialist papers of America have been re-enforcing the impression created by Gorky and other Russian Socialists, that the Anarchists of Russia are merely cut-throats and robbers who do all manner of criminal acts in the name of Anarchism. At last the Russian Anarchists are being heard from themselves. It is true they must be reckoned upon as a fighting quantity. It is true they are a little too busy with the agitation against economic as well as political servitude, to split hairs about "what constituted invasion," after the manner of American Anarchists. But it is not true that they are robbers and murderers, as Gorky, Hurwich and others have said. They are believers in the fundamental ideas of Bakounine and Kropotkin, and they teach and do acts of general expropriation and reprisal upon the bourgeoisie, as well as the autocracy—not acts of petty larceny and intimidation.

A fairly correct idea of the attitude of the most extreme among them may be gathered from a report and manifesto issued by the Workingmen's Anarchist-Communist Group of Ekaterinoslav, concerning the death of Paul Golmann, printed in *Le Libertaire* of September 16. From this it appears that Golmann, a mere boy of twenty, having wearied of the inaction and authoritarianism of the Socialist revolutionists, had espoused Anarchism and taken it upon himself to determine when and where to strike his blows. Having failed in an attack upon the life of a certain spy and informer, his next revolutionary act was to assist in the expropriation of

the government receipts from the tax on spirits, amounting to 6,500 roubles; his third and last effort was an attempt to blow up the train bearing the Government Railroad Commission and the Minister of Public Highways, whose oppressions he, as a railway worker, had immediately felt. For some reason the Minister's train did not arrive, and the bomb-thrower concluded to hurl his missive into the first-class coach of the express train. The bourgeois papers reported the attack as made by mistake, "the causes of the attack being unknown." This report the Anarchist group repudiates in the following words of the manifesto:

"Ah, poor impotent minds! You do not guess, you cannot find out, these 'causes.' The causes of this attack are the capitalist system itself, the division of people into exploiters and exploited, poor and rich, starving and overfed. Poor souls! When will you understand that at last the hour of reckoning has struck; that until this division disappears the rich will have no more tranquility, will be attacked without mercy by the disinherited. The bomb of the third of May was directed against the over-fed rich."

Golmann, being wounded in the foot, was obliged to go to a hospital to be operated upon, and during his stay was arrested for complicity in the above-named acts. His comrades rescued him from the hospital, not to save his life, which they knew was impossible, but to give him a chance to strike the one last blow he coveted; he had said: "What sort of an Anarchist would a man without a foot make! If I lose it, as soon as I am cured, I will go no farther than the first police station, throw a bomb into it, and go up with it myself." The police, however, discovered the place he had been taken to the same day of his escape from the hospital. Finding himself surrounded, and unable to move on account of his wounds, he fired two shots among them, killing one and wounding another, and then shot himself.

His body was secretly interred by the police, but the people, getting wind of it, gathered about the cemetery, whence they were driven back by the Cossacks, several being wounded and others arrested. The manifesto concludes with the following words:

"Sleep tranquilly, dear Comrade. The police prevented us from honoring thy memory by letting the revolutionary song be heard. Ah, well! In thy memory we shall let them hear the firing of brownings and the fracas of explosions. Thou knowest well that thou wilt be avenged. 'For every one of us they kill, we will throw a hundred to the earth,' runs the French Anarchist song; and the word of the Anarchist accords with his works. Sleep tranquilly, dear Comrade.—August, 1906."

There is no mistaking the meaning of this manifesto. It is practically the ghost of Emile Henry talking. It is the sort of Anarchism which must be expected where the general social condition is one of upheaval and every party is appealing to force. The main question is the application of the principle of self-direction and individual responsibility to warfare upon class conditions.

FRANCE.

The Anarchists, as well as many non-Anarchistic sympathizers with fair play, have been working hard to obtain a reversal of the court decision in the case of Louis Grandidier condemned to a year's imprisonment for an offense which he did not commit. The case is as follows: Grandidier was hated for his anti-militarist agitation, and the police only waited for some opportunity to seize him. He paid a visit to a certain Dagois, a man who seems to have been a sort of fac-simile of Orchard in the Moyer-Haywood case. The police discovered explosives in Dagois's house, and "persuaded" the latter to inculpate Grandidier; he himself was then left free. Out of their hands, Dagois revoked his charge and declared himself guilty. Grandidier was then released and Dagois sentenced to six months. Again in the hands of authority, Dagois renewed his accusations and Grandidier was then sentenced to a year in prison. Thus the sole testimony upon which Grandidier was convicted was that of an individual who saw an opportunity to extricate himself at the expense of another. Yet notwithstanding all the efforts of able lawyers and influential persons whose sense of justice is outraged, and appeals to the Minister Clemenceau, have been futile and Louis Grandidier has been held in durance, transferred

from one prison to another without opportunity to communicate with his friends, and denied even the one relief of seeing his mother. The methods pursued remind one very much of the treatment of Moyer and Haywood, the transference from prison to prison having been effected in the night in both cases, and in both cases without opportunity of communication. How republics resemble each other!

* * *

In the opening days of October took place the annual departure of conscripts to the army. The results of the active propaganda of the anti-militarists were shown in widespread ebullitions of dissatisfaction among the soldiers. At Brioude 400 "reservists" marched through the streets singing the "Internationale" because it had been announced that they must proceed to St. Etienne by forced marches. The men compelled the journey to be made by rail by threatening to fall sick in a body at the first halting place. At Beauvais some soldier wrote on the platform of the station with chalk: "Long live the Anti-Militarist League." When the officer ordered him to be taken to the barracks, the whole company protested violently, and began to sing the "Internationale."

At Senlis a group of reservists took refuge in an old church singing the "Internationale" and refusing to come out at the command of their officers. And there are others and others.

The agitation continues, numerous addresses being given by our comrades Malato, Israel, Libertad, Armand, etc. L'Anarchie issued a special address to the Conscripts, pointing out to them that they are chiefly to be used to suppress their fellow workingmen in their attempts to win better social conditions. To quote: "All régimes, all governments in succession have always employed the power of the army for what they are pleased to call 'the maintenance of domestic order,' which means in plain words, 'the defense of the strong-box and the protection of the spoliators against the logical reprisals of the proletariat.'" This appeal was largely distributed among the conscripts.

* * *

A very interesting experiment along the lines of the

newer education is being undertaken under the direction of Madeleine Vernet, at Neuilly-Plaisance, Department of Seine-et-Oise. The experiment is called L'Avenir Social. Its purposes are, "to bring up the child for itself; to develop in it sane ideas, a conscious reasoning power, energy and will. . . . . We wish to teach it a trade not in the spirit of routine, but by developing its personal initiative; to awaken the idea of association, collective life; to give it a taste for free labor and inspire in it a contempt for servitude." The institution receives children from three to eight years of age, and keeps them till they are fifteen. The cost of board, clothing and instruction is only thirty francs a month. Some twenty children are already installed. Details are given in September number of *L'Ere Nouvelle*.

It will be extremely interesting to follow the development of this effort.

Another proposition of allied nature has been made by Comrade E. Heintze, who offers a large piece of ground to be used during the summer by such of the comrades as wish their children to be out in the open learning nature secrets as a wholesome supplement to their deficient book-instruction in the school term. The proposition is that the women comrades have charge and the life be an out-of-door one as much as possible, those wishing to make themselves useful as teachers, giving instructions in hygiene, gardening, drawing from nature, music, botany and astronomy. The proposition is made now that the details may be discussed during the winter. Evidently our French comrades are troubled, like ourselves, with the discussing disease.

Two new free communist associations are in process of formation in Paris. A colony of Communist Anarchist printers, grouped for the purpose of printing and publishing Anarchist literature, is to be installed on a fine farm at Saint-Germain near Paris. The work is already begun.

GERMANY.

On the 5th of October our comrades of "Der Freie Arbeiter," of Berlin, were indicted for blasphemy in an article contained in the monthly Anti-Militarist supple-

ment to the journal. The edition was seized and the houses of many comrades were searched. The issue of October 13 contains an appeal to the comrades to sustain the paper materially in the fight now forced upon them. Address Felix Kindler, Berlin, S. 26, Oranien-Strasse, Hof III.

On the 7th of November, Comrade Adolph Schäwe, who has just completed twelve years in prison, will be released. The facts of his case are as follows: In August, 1894, police annoyances had become very frequent. Schäwe and Dräger, two of the most active in Berlin, had been followed about by the police so much, even going and coming from work, that they were never able to keep their jobs. They had therefore resolved to go to Vienna, on the morning of the 14th of August. On the evening of the 13th, they dined at a restaurant kept by a friend, and as they came out Dräger noticed that Schäwe was followed, and called the latter's attention to it. Schäwe then saw Busse, a policeman well known to the Anarchists, who threw himself upon our comrade. A genuine fight followed and the policeman was somewhat damaged. Another policeman came to his assistance, but Dräger gave him sound correction. A crowd gathered, the police arrived and took our men in charge. Dräger nevertheless escaped. Schäwe tried to do the same, and drew his revolver on some of the policemen. He had almost got away when two other policeman re-captured him. One of them named Zachau got a ball in the arm. Overcome by numbers, Schäwe was taken before the chief of police. Next day two policemen, revolver in hand, went to Dräger's house and arrested him. Twenty-two other comrades who had nothing to do with the affair were searched and put under arrest, but released after a day or two. After three months' detention the two friends were brought before the Assizes. The indictment charged them with attempt to kill, giving blows and wounds, resistance to an officer in discharge of his duty, offenses in actions and words, Anarchistic conspiracies. The arguments lasted from 9 a. m. till midnight. The usual farcial proceedings. Dräger was condemned to five years in prison, Schäwe to fifteen years in solitary confinement. Dräger left prison in November, 1899, and is

back with the comrades. Schäwe, whose term was reduced to twelve years, will have served his time out on November 7. Devoted as ever he returns to us in the same mind, but with his body much weakened by his long and cruel durance. The Berlin comrades have opened subscriptions in his favor. Lists are to be had from Der Anarchist, Grosse Frankfurter Strasse 146, III, Berlin, N. O.

BOHEMIA.

It is gratifying to learn that in this relatively small territory seven Anarchist papers are appearing. Michael Kacha, the editor of *Práce* (Work), was last June sentenced to six weeks in prison and a fine, for having published a pamphlet of Girault's. Following are the suggestive titles of some of these journals: *Without Government*, a monthly; *The Miners' Paper*, weekly; *The Proletarian, The Mother of Liberty, The Anarchist Review. Nová Omladina*, a strong advocate of unionism as well as anarchy, is a bi-weekly.

CORSICA.

Away down in the famous little island Anarchistic-Communism is being put to the test. The experiment is now some six months old, and a correspondent writes that if they can manage to worry through the coming six months, success is assured. They are in sore straits at present, and ask that aid be sent to Comrade Escalais, Communist Colony, Cognocoli par Pila Canale, Corsica. The difficulty will be over as soon as the first harvest can be gathered, and the entire need is not more than $10.00 a month, living being extremely cheap. It would be a pity that for so small a sum, an attempt which seems to be a moral success and to afford wide future possibilities, should fail.

SPAIN.

Ferrer's Modern School has been reopened, thanks to outside pressure on the government; but Ferrer's fortune has been seized and the endowment of the school is gone. Our comrade will probably receive a several

years' sentence for the crime of having been acquainted with Morral.

Tierra y Libertad is once more appearing.

HOLLAND.

On September 23, the Dutch Free Communists held a Congress at Utrecht. Eight groups were represented. Measures for furthering the propaganda were adopted. The existence of the monthly *Grond on Vrijheid* was assured. Next Congress to be held at Amsterdam in 1907.

❦ ❦ ❦

TO THE READERS OF MOTHER EARTH.

Those of you who have been startled by the rumor of Comrade Alexander Berkman's disappearance and his supposed kidnapping I want to inform that there was little truth in the story. People never realize that there are worse things in human life than merely external forces. But what made it impossible for our friend to continue his tour lies in the terrible contrast of solitary confinement, enforced silence and monotony and the rush and hurry of our daily lives. Few have stood the years of hell as bravely as Comrade Berkman, but the lack of idealism and enthusiasm in radical ranks and the pettiness and sordidness of our existence were too much for his sensitive nature. He hoped to regain interest in life through a tour, but before he was half through he realized that one can never find the strength to live outside of himself and that to find oneself at all, one needs absolute harmony and peace.

He has therefore decided to retire for a time and hopes those who have been disappointed will understand and appreciate.

EMMA GOLDMAN.

THE REBELLION OF ALVIRA.

By EMMA LEE.

"ALVIROOOO!"

The last syllable rings through the house like an Indian war-whoop. Wearily the maid retraces the two flights of steps.

In her hand she has a pair of shoes. Submissively she stands before Miss Perkins, whose hired maid she is, and awaits that lady's pleasure.

With exasperating deliberation Miss Perkins finishes the page she is reading and pauses in the act of turning a leaf.

"Oh, yes," she says, with a nonchalance that fashionable ladies always assume when addressing their dependents. "You have the sroes to clean. I was going to ask you to do something else—but go ahead and finish the shoes."

Alvira turned to leave the room.

"Before you go, get me a glass of water. Thank you. Now you may go."

As Alvira reaches the bottom step she hears "Alvira! Alvirooo!"

Under her breath she says, "Drat that old pest. I wonder what she wants now!"

Aloud she says, "Yes, Miss Perkins!"

"Before you get your hands soiled, cleaning the shoes, I want you to go to the garret and look in the box under the sea chest, and bring me a little white shawl you will find there tied up in moth paper."

Alvira courtesies and goes to the garret.

Five minutes later—"Alviraoooo!"

Alvira returns, still carrying the uncleaned shoes in her hand.

"I have just remembered that I gave the shawl to a needy woman, last fall. That shoulder cape hanging on the rocker will do."

Having adjusted the shoulder cape, she starts upstairs to rearrange the things she has tumbled out, in search of the white shawl.

"Alvirooo!"

The poor, harrassed girl returns.

"Alvira, will you hurry up the shoes? I am going out."

Just as she has put the finishing stroke on the shoes, and before she has had time to wash her hands, she hears the old familiar cry:

"Alviraooo!"

Snatching up the shoes, she hastens up with them.

"Oh, you have brought the shoes! Oh, well, you may put them away. I have changed my mind about going out. I want you to go up with me to the trunk room."

Alvira meekly follows as they go up to the garret.

"Oh, Alvira! How untidy everything is! You really ought to take better care of things. I guess I will look through that box of laces. No, not that one—yes, that is it. Oh, Alvira, how soiled your hands are! Mrs. Brown's maid always has such immaculate hands! How I wish I could get you to do so!"

Two hours later the store room is a mass of confusion.

"Miss Perkins, is it not time to get ready for dinner?"

"Oh, we have a good half hour yet!"

An hour later—"Gracious, Alvira, I will have just time to dress for dinner. Can you brush up a bit? No, you won't have time. And how frouzly you do look! How I do wish you would learn to be neat!"

At nine o'clock Alvira crawls wearily to the cheerless little room in the attic. Its broken misfit furniture does not jar upon her. She is too tired to care if it is comfortable or not. With chattering teeth, for few ladies make any provision for heating the servants' rooms, she crawls under the bedclothes.

"Alvirooo! Alviraooo!"

Alvira, pulling the bedding closer around her head to deaden the sound, says, with rebellion creeping out in every accent:

"Let the old cow bellow! Nothing short of a fire or earthquake will rouse me out of bed to-night!"

Miss Perkins to a visiting friend: "Oh, these worthless servants! That girl does nothing but dawdle around all day, and as soon as she has finished washing the dinner dishes, she sneaks off to bed, and Gabriel himself could not awaken her!"

UNEXPECTED CHARITY.

(Stories from My Own Life.)

By SADAKICHI HARTMANN.

It was near midnight. A light fog had settled upon Union Square. Fourteenth Street, the great thoroughfare for the barter of female flesh was growing quieter; only now and then a cab swaying from one side to another rattled by, or a couple of men and women, half drunk, came staggering along.

A cold biting wind blew the drizzling rain into the faces of the few pedestrians who were hurrying through the square. The street lamps flickered hazily through the mist, and from the leafless branches the rain dripped cold and pitiless upon the asphalt pavement.

In mute despair, soaked to the skin, I sat upon one of the wet benches. I was wretchedly dressed for such weather. Even the ironic smile on my lips had vanished. I felt faint, stupefied with hunger, cold and want of sleep. My consciousness consisted only of two words that I murmured, shivering, at long intervals: what next! . . . . what next! Sometimes the heavy tread of a policeman was heard in the square. I rose and dragged myself to another bench. The lighted clock at Tiffany's moved towards two. Everything had grown quiet, when a hoarse female voice shouted into my ear: "Chappie, you'll catch a cold." I slowly opened my eyes, I saw the muffled up figure of a woman standing before me.

"Are you going to camp out all night?" I nodded. A smile of sympathy lit up her face. "That's tough." Then she threw a scrutinizing glance at my shabby clothes.

"What else is there for me to do?" I murmured in an indifferent tone, shrugging my shoulders.

"Clear off!" she ejaculated, sizing up my situation. "It's too beastly weather for that. Come along with me. Business is on the bum anyhow."

I looked at her in stupid astonishment and stammered: "I haven't a damn cent to my name."

"Botheration! Do you think I take you for a millionaire? Come along anyhow, or you'll see the place

where the ashes grow," and she took me by the arm. "I know what it is." And so we left the square. Silence everywhere save the drip, drip from the roofs and the howl of an occasional gust of wind.

We arrived at a plain-looking house on Third Avenue. She opened the door with a latch key. "Don't make any noise," and we felt our way over the dark stairs to a room on the top floor.

She lit the gas, motioned me to sit down, saying: "None of your bloomin' style with me," and busied herself with a little oil stove. Soon some hot tea and bread and butter was before me. My whole body trembled with the violence of hunger and I swallowed nervously all I could get hold of.

She watched me, smiling at my appetite. She opened her waist. "It's so warm in here," and slowly began to undress. She was a plain-looking girl with a large grinning mouth and stupid little eyes. Pointing to the oil stove she remarked: "That's the way we have to get along when business is slack. I stay a good deal with one fellow, but he is dead broke just now." She took a few dollar notes out of her stocking. "That's all I earned this week. I have a baby, you know. Feel it jump. I have to be careful now, so that I won't do any harm to the child. And yet I would like to earn as much as possible to take care of it."

Then humming a melody she pulled off her stockings and jumped into bed. She curled herself up under the blankets and motioned to me to come and do the same.

Coming to the bedside I murmured: "You are a mighty good girl. How did you ever come to such a trade?"

"That's a sad story. Don't let us talk about it. Get to bed, Chappie," and she munched at an apple.

I lay down at her side, and thought that she was as young and poor and miserable as I, and that her case was as helpless as mine. Outside the fog became thicker and thicker, wrapping the houses as in a shroud. I drew nearer and nearer to her, and she threw her arms tightly around my neck—and thus we two outcasts fell asleep, hidden from the coldness and cruelty of the world.

1887 1906

19th International Anniversary Celebration

IN MEMORY OF THE

Martyrs of the Labor Movement

AUGUST SPIES, ALBERT PARSONS, LOUIS LINGG,
GEORGE ENGEL and ADOLPH FISCHER

under the auspices of

FREIHEIT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION

on Sunday, November 11, 1906

in the LARGE HALL of the

Labor Temple, 243-247 East 84th Street, New York

COMMENCING AT 2 P.M. ADMISSION, 10c A PERSON

Speakers: H. Kelly, Emma Goldman, and others

"Freedom"

A general of Anarchist Communism Monthly

3c per Copy, 36c per Year

127 Ossulston Street
LONDON, N. W., England

Also through the office of "Mother Earth"

"Freiheit"

Published by the

Freiheit Publishing Association

Editor: MAX BAGINSKI

P. O. Box 1719

5 Cts. per Copy, $2.00 per Year

Jefferson Preparatory School

185 HENRY STREET, NEW YORK

"A Progressive and Successful School"

REGENTS, CIVIL SERVICE AND COLLEGIATE COURSES

Special Classes in English

All Classes Carefully Graded | Personal Attention Given to Every Pupil

Classes Open to Beginners as Well as to Advanced Pupils

SAMUEL FRIEDWALD, Principal

JOSEPH HYMSON

...Pharmacist...

226 BROOME STREET

CORNER ESSEX STREET

NEW YORK

OPEN ALL NIGHT Tel., 105 Orchard

Miss D. R. EDISON

Trained Nurse

126 FIRST AVE., NEW YORK

MRS. J. MOLLACK

522 EAST 84th STREET NEW YORK

Dealer in **COFFEE AND TEA**

SELECTED MOCHA AND JAVA	(1 lb. 30 Cts., 5 lbs. $1.35)
EXTRA VIENNA BLEND	(1 lb. 25 Cts., 5 lbs. $1.15)
FAMILY JEWEL	(1 lb. 20 Cts., 5 lbs. 90 Cts.)
FINEST MIXED TEA	(from 40 Cts. a lb. upwards)
ENGLISH BREAKFAST TEA	(from 40 Cts. a lb. upwards)

All Orders Promptly Attended. Free Delivery

COLLEGE REGENTS CIVIL SERVICE COMMERCIAL DEPTS.

Figures show that with an education you have forty chances of success to one of your uneducated brother.

Where can you get the essentials of a High-School course without its useless frills and its four years?

Where can you prepare for a profession in less than a year and a half? Our hundreds of graduates have all been satisfied on this point. We can satisfy you.

JOIN OUR SCHOOL NOW. Wherever you live you will find one of our Schools in your neighborhood. We have two Schools down-town, a branch School UP-TOWN at 8 EAST 116th STREET, near Fifth Avenue, and one School in Brooklyn.

ABRAHAM RUBINSTEIN
Principal Evening Dep.

MORRIS R. FINKELSTEIN, A. B.
Principal Day Dep.

Uptown School
M. SCHONBERG, Mgr.

Brooklyn School
A. MILLER, Mgr.

MANHATTAN PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Chartered by the State of New York

Main School: 201 East Broadway
Branch School: Terr. Lyceum Bldg.
Uptown School: 8 East 116th Street
Brooklyn School: 76 Graham Avenue

International Book Store

Established 1892 — A. Wasserman, Proprietor

English, German, French, Russian, Jewish and Polish Books—Books in all Languages Bought, Sold and Exchanged—Radical Books—Russian Circulating Library—Fine Stationery and Bookbinding—School and College Books a Specialty—Souvenir Postal Cards—Blank Books—Composition Books—Fountain Pens—Leather Postal Cards—Congratulation Cards—Autograph Albums :: :: ::

45 Clinton St., Bet. Stanton and Rivington Sts., New York City

---

WILLIAM SIEGMEISTER'S DRUG STORES

423 GRAND STREET, Cor. Attorney | 257 BROOME STREET, Cor. Orchard

NEW YORK

Dr. MORRIS SCHNEER

Surgeon Dentist

216 East Broadway New York

N. W. Cor. Clinton Street

Careful attention given to all Prescriptions filled at

Dr. S. HARKAVY'S

3 DRUG STORES

436 CHERRY ST., cor. Rutgers

193 BROOME ST., cor. Suffolk

256 CHERRY ST., cor. Jackson

EVERYBODY USES

COLUMBIA TEA

SCHECHNOVITZ, 193 Division Street, New York

Country Orders Promptly Attended

The Well-Known

SHOLEM

Is on Deck.

I BEG to inform all my friends that I opened a fine Restaurant, where excellent food is served in the best style. Satisfaction guaranteed. The only restaurant I own is at

280 Broome St.

NEW YORK

A SOCIAL TIME AT

THE PEOPLE'S

Cafe and Restaurant

299 Broome Street New York

Abramson & Epstein, Props.

OPEN DAY AND NIGHT

HARRY FEINGOLD'S

Cafe and Restaurant

Member of Br. 39 A. R.

Tasteful Dishes; Pleasant Company

OPEN DAY AND NIGHT

H. FEINGOLD, 45 FORSYTH ST., NEW YORK

M. N. Maisel's Book Store

194 East Broadway, New York

A FEW SPECIAL BARGAINS

	Publ. at	My Price
GORKY—A Night's Lodging	$1.00	$0.45
GORKY—Summer Folk	1.00	.45
GORKY—Children of the Sun....	1.00	.45
These are the only dramas of Gorky translated into English.		
GORKY—Three of them, cloth...	1.00	.50
GORKY—Foma Gordeyeff, cloth..	1.00	.50
The only two novels of Gorky translated into English.		
L. ANDREEFF—The Red Laugh...	....	.35
TOLSTOI'S Complete Works, 12 vols. Cloth. Best Edition	12.00	8.50
IBSEN'S—Best 10 Dramas. Paper. Complete translations ..	3.00	2.40
SPENCER'S Synthetic Philosophy, consisting of 10 vols. Appleton's only copyright edition; cloth.	20.00	8.00
DARWIN'S Works. 10 vols. Appleton's copyright Edition; cloth	25.00	8.00

I will supply these books at these reduced prices only as long as present stock is on hand.

Prices are net cash. If sent by mail, 10c must be added for every cloth volume.

MEETINGS

Progressive Library
106 Forsyth Street. Meetings every Sunday evening.

Brooklyn Philosophical Association. Meets every Sunday, 3 P. M., at Long Island Business College, 143 S. 8th Street.

Manhattan Library Club
Meets every Friday, 8 P. M., at German Masonic Hall, 220 East 15th Street.

Harlem Liberal Alliance
Every Friday, 8 P. M., at Fraternity Hall, 100 W. 116th Street, cor. Lenox.

Liberal Art Society. Meets every Friday, 8.30 P. M., at Terrace Lyceum, 206 East Broadway.

"Mother Earth"

For Sale at all the above mentioned places

10 Cents a Copy

One Dollar a Year

AGENTS FOR "MOTHER EARTH"

NEW YORK CITY.
M. N. Maisel, Bookstore, 194 E. Broadway.
A. Wasserman, 45 Clinton St.
Progressive Library, 106 Forsyth St.
E. C. Walker, 244 W. 143rd St.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.
N. Notkin, Cor. E. Lehigh & Thompson Sts.

PITTSBURG, PA.
Mrs. George Seldes, 1801 Centre Ave.

CLEVELAND, O.
P. Rovner, 35 Putnam St.

ST. LOUIS, MO.
Jos. Rothstein, 717½ Morgan St.

CHICAGO, ILL.
M. A. Schmidt, 1367 Jackson St.
S. Hammersmark, Norwood Park.
H. Havel, 45 N. Clark St.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.
Leo Kopczynski, 941 Seventh St.

BUFFALO, N. Y.
L. Finkel, 208 Broadway.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.
Mr. Rubenfeld, 65 Weld St.

DETROIT, MICH.
Carl Nold, 167 Hale St.

UTICA, N. Y.
S. Bookbinder, 94 Liberty St.

ATLANTIC CITY.
M. Kislick, 410 Mediterranean Ave.

ALBANY, N. Y.
Leo Malmed, 92 Dallins St.

SAN FRANCISCO.
Rosa Fritz, 537 Oak St.

TORONTO, CAN.
Wm. Simons, 24 Agnes St.

LONDON, ENGLAND.
Thomas H. Keel, 127 Ossulston St., London N. W.

CHELSEA, MASS.
S. Lampert, 73 Sixth Street.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.
Max Fine, 423 Harrison Street.

MOTHER EARTH

Invites Her Children to
Joyous Forgetfulness of
the Troubles of Life

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23d, 1906

At 8 P. M.

...At...

WEBSTER HALL

119-125 East 11th Street, New York

At the

Masquerade Ball

TICKETS, 35 CENTS
Through Our Office